The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1898.

The Week.

The exhibition made by the United States Senate on Friday was, on the whole, the most discreditable yet seen. The Teller resolution, declaring that the Government may pay its bonds in silver dollars, which are intrinsically worth not half as much as gold, was passed, after a long discussion, by a vote of 47 to 32, or, allowing for the pairs, 52 to 37, if every member of the body had been present, one seat from Oregon being vacant. The affirmative included one Senator from New England, Chandler of New Hampshire, while only one Sound-Money Democrat, Caffery of Louisiana, was recorded in the negative. All the other Democratic representatives of sound-money States, Murphy of New York, Smith of New Jersey, even Gray of Delaware, voted with the Bryan Democrats and the Silver Republicans. Their excuse seems to have been that in their opinion the resolution was not equivalent to a declaration for free coinage (although some of its supporters claimed that it was), but was a mere legal statement of a right which the Government has always possessed, and which does nobody any harm so long as silver dollars are on a parity with gold, as now. This is a pretty weak excuse, but the attitude of men who are ready to vote on one side or the other is respectable compared with that of Allison of Iowa and Burrows of Michigan, who sat silent while their names were twice called on the proposition that all bonds are payable "in gold coin or its equivalent." The best that can be said of the day's work is the remark of Mr. Aldrich in closing the debate, that the "financial eccentricities of the American Senate have ceased to interest the American public to any appreciable extent."

There was a certain dramatic quality in the promptness with which the House took up the challenge sent over by the Senate in the shape of the Teller resolution, and there was something inspiring in a record of yeas from the Republican side which was broken only by a single nay from one North Carolina member of the party, and the shirking response of "Present" from another Republican Representative of that State. Leaving North Carolina out of the account, the Republican party in the House is now unanimous in taking the right side on a question involving silver. This is the first time that such unanimity has been reached since the silver craze broke out. It was almost exactly twenty years ago that a vote was taken in the House on the same resolution, which had been pushed through the upper branch by Stanley Matthews, then a Republican Senator in good standing, 18 of the other 33 Republicans recorded standing with him. When the roll was called in the House on the 29th of January, 1878, a decided majority of the Republican Representatives, 75 out of 131, voted in the affirmative. Among them were such prominent men as McKinley of Ohio and Cannon of Illinois, with every other Republican member from Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa, except Garfield of Ohio. Even after fifteen years of "fooling" with the silver issue, the Republican party was far from being united on the right side when President Cleveland convened Congress in extra session during the summer of 1893 for the repeal of the silver-purchase act. On the final roll-call, August 28, 1893, twenty-five Republicans recorded themselves against repeal, among those on the wrong side being again Cannon of Illinois, with Hepburn of Iowa, and the three Republicans from Kansas.

Evidence steadily accumulates that public sentiment in favor of the gold standard, and in favor of currency reform based on that standard, is far stronger than the politicians suppose. A Wisconsin Senator voted on Friday for the Teller resolution declaring the bonds payable in silver, but the Legislature of that State is on record by an overwhelming majority in favor of the gold standard, and the silver candidate for President in that State was beaten by over 100,000 votes in the last election. An Iowa Senator sat silent in his seat on Friday while the roll was called on a proposition that all Government bonds are payable "in gold coin or its equivalent," but the Indianapolis convention last week was attended by fifteen delegations from that State, numbering sixty of the most prominent business men, who unanimously adopted a resolution requesting the Iowa Representatives in Congress to "use their best efforts to secure currency reform based on the gold standard," and the Governor of Iowa presided over the convention. Even more significant and encouraging is the announcement from Cheyenne that the State Treasurer of Wyoming has resigned the chairmanship of the Laramie County Republican central committee, because Senators Warren and Clark voted for the Teller resolution. He holds that the Republicans of Wyoming will not be forced by these leaders into a position antagonistic to that of the President and the national Republican party, and his resignation is believed to be the beginning of a fight by the gold-standard Republicans of the State to take control of the party organization out of the hands of Senators Warren and Clark and make this year's State campaign on a gold-standard platform.

Senator Turpie's carefully prepared speech of Monday week on the Teller resolution, now at hand in the *Congressional Record*, shows that the need of information on our past financial legislation is not limited to the "younger generation" about whom Mr. Vest is so solicitous. Mr. Turpie's entire argument is based on one positive historical assertion. "Prior to the passage of the act to strengthen the public credit in 1869," the Senator begins, "the bonds of the United States were payable in any lawful money. . . . The public credit had successfully passed" through the strain of war "without any law that our bonds should be payable in coin." This is strange history to spread before the "younger generation." If Senator Turpie is so ignorant of the financial incidents of 1863 as to suppose his statement to be true, we will refer him to the recent compilation, by the Register of the Treasury, of the provisions inscribed on the successive bond issues of this Government. From that official summary he will learn that something over one billion dollars in bonds, issued between 1862 and 1869, bore on their face the superscription, "payable, interest and principal, in coin," and that these words were in the act of March 3, 1863. Mr. Turpie seems to be equally unaware of the fact, familiar to most readers of history, that the public-credit act of 1869 applied primarily to the legal-tender notes, and in the case of bonds merely reaffirmed the already publicly declared purpose of the Government.

But in what coin were principal and interest payable? Let the Senator himself inform us. "There was at that time," says Mr. Turpie, speaking of this very period, "only an inconsiderable amount of standard silver dollars in existence—not enough to pay interest on the bonds." The simple-minded reader might then imagine that a provision for coin payment was to all intents and purposes provision for settlement in gold. But it seems not; for in the next breath Mr. Turpie tells us that when the act of 1873 discontinued the further coinage of the standard silver dollar, "there was nothing left but the gold dollar and its multiples with which to pay the bonded debt," and that "this transmutation of paper bonds into gold exceeded anything in the history of the Rosicrucians of the Middle Ages." That is to say, the Senator first declares, what we have shown not to be true, that the war debt

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was all payable in notes, and then assumes, what he himself admits to be untrue, that it might have been paid in silver, and from these two premises arrives at the conclusion that the "syndicate of debt and gold" has somehow been cheating the Government out of its fair share of a contract. If we were not so familiar with this method of reasoning on this subject, we should say that we have no patience with it. But patience comes with long practice, though we are sorry to see, from Senator Turpie's case, that knowledge sometimes does not. We thank the Senator, however, for his plain confession that there was virtually no such currency in circulation prior to 1873 as silver dollars.

Senator Platt of Connecticut and Senator Chandler had a colloquy last week on the subject of bimetallism, the former contending that we have bimetallism in this country now because we use both gold and silver in our currency. Chandler maintained that bimetallism exists only where unlimited coinage is allowed to both metals. Chandler happens to be right in this instance. If Mr. Platt's contention could be sustained, we should have not merely bimetallism, but trimetallism or quadrimetallism, since we use nickel and copper also in our coinage. We use these metals in substantially the same way that we use silver; that is, the Government purchases and coins the metals, and then sells the coins to the public at prices much higher than the cost of production. It does not receive any such metals from private individuals for coinage, although it receives gold for that purpose in unlimited quantities. The phrase bimetallism is of comparatively recent origin. It was invented by Cernuschi about twenty years ago as a substitute for the phrase "double standard," to avoid confusion. There cannot be two standards at the same time and place, although there may be two metals admitted to unlimited coinage. Bimetallism means double legal tender rather than double standard.

There seems to be no doubt that the treaty for the annexation of Hawaii is beaten as it stands to-day. The best authorities at Washington agree that it lacks at least three votes of the necessary two-thirds, and some say as many as five. The opponents of annexation are ready to have the roll called without further delay, while the advocates of the scheme are pressing for postponement, on the chance that they may win over the votes which they now lack. Meanwhile they are resting their hopes upon the efforts of the two Presidents. Mr. McKinley is using all the influence of the Administration to carry through his personal policy (for control, and not annexation, was the policy demanded by his party in the platform upon which he was elected). President Dole is doing his best to help Mr. McKinley, but the advocates of the scheme do not seem at all sure that his visit to Washington is really helping them.

Senator Frye, in his speech at the dinner of the Manufacturers' Association on Thursday evening, admitted that the treaty is lost unless there is a change in sentiment among his colleagues, and urged his hearers to "exercise your influence upon the Senate of the United States to help us get the two-thirds vote there." Mr. Frye brought out all the old bugbears. He declared that we should lose the Hawaiian market unless we annexed the islands, though we have never had to own them in order to enjoy this trade. He predicted that, "if the treaty is not ratified by the United States Senate, in less than a year the Hawaiian Islands will be under the protectorate of Great Britain," although there is no reason why we should not continue to exercise the same control hereafter as heretofore. He brought out the "key" argument, and asked, "Where are you going to get your coal?" suppressing the fact that we have a perpetual right to the use of Pearl Harbor as a coaling station. There was, of course, "applause," and cries of "No, no!" were raised at the appropriate place, but proof is still lacking that the business men of the country are frightened by the bugbears or convinced by the arguments which the advocates of annexation bring forward. If the treaty shall ever be carried, it will not be public sentiment that does it, but the power of patronage exerted by the President.

That misunderstanding in Nebraska about the price of sugar-beets is made public at a most unlucky time for the waning fortunes of the Hawaiian treaty. It seems that the refiners are offering the farmers contracts for the year's product of sugar-beets at $4 the ton, as last year, but with a proviso that if Hawaii is annexed the rate shall be $3.50. This is dastardly. It also is really something very like *lèse-majesté*. Has not the Secretary of Agriculture officially declared that Hawaiian sugar will not compete at all with American beet sugar? Has not Morgan announced it, Lodge asserted it, Frye roared it, Allison rather guessed it might be so? Yet here are mere private business men cruelly offering contracts which show that Hawaiian sugar will compete, and will drive down the price of beets fifty cents a ton. The rascals should be prosecuted. Senator Thurston has been accused of being lukewarm on the treaty, and the President has labored with him; but his constituents are the chief offenders. Such nefarious methods as theirs would defeat any treaty. But we are confident that the annexationists are not at the end of their resources. They will insert in the treaty a provision to give every farmer $4.50 a ton for his beets, to be paid out of the contingent fund, and then where will these miserable $3.50-a-ton refiners hide themselves?

The House committee on appropriations is evidently not going to war along with our bellicose assistant-secretaries and second-lieutenants. We judge this from an inspection of the fortification bill as reported by the committee on Saturday. It carries only a little more than $4,000,000, instead of the $13,500,000 which the War Department authorities had declared to be "absolutely necessary." But Chairman Cannon ruthlessly cut off more than two-thirds of these absolutely necessary appropriations. The department asked for $5,000,000 to construct gun and mortar batteries to protect our "defenceless coasts." It got $1,000,000. The department begged for at least ten rounds of powder and armor-piercing projectiles for each gun and mortar expected to be in position by the end of the fiscal year. It would be too humiliating, it said, to have the ammunition give out just as it had a "hostile fleet" half whipped. But the committee voted money for only about three rounds. So it went all along the line. The eminent military authorities solemnly told the committee that they would not answer for the consequences to the country if their $13,000,000 was not voted. But the committee replied that it would not answer for the consequences to itself if it did vote such a sum, and remorselessly cut it down to less than one-third.

The best thing about the election of Mr. McComas as United States Senator from Maryland is the fact that the opponents of machine politics in that State are pleased with it. It is not the Democratic party only which has suffered from the evils of boss rule. The Republicans have had leaders who were anxious to establish a system which would be quite as offensive as Gormanism. Wellington, who was elected Senator two years ago, believes in the boss system, and set out to run the Republican party in just the same way as Gorman has so long run the Democratic. Wellington was unhorsed when the State convention met last September, but the lesson was lost upon Malster, the new Republican Mayor of Baltimore, who controlled several members of the Legislature from that city, and tried to dictate the choice of Senator. The election of Mr. McComas, who was clearly the favorite of the majority of his party, thus not only secures an excellent Senator, but shows that the people of Maryland know how to protect

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

themselves against the substitution of Republican bossism for Democratic.

The retirement of Mr. Preston from the office of Director of the Mint will be universally regretted by the friends of sound money, although we have every reason to think well of his successor. Mr. Preston had risen by his merits alone to the head of this important bureau. He had no political "pull." His work was the only testimonial and the only cause of his promotion. He ought to have been retained in the position of Director because of eminent and proved fitness. In any other government than ours he would have been retained. The bureau of the mint is peculiarly a bureau of details. It calls for special knowledge and acquaintance with a multitude of facts which cannot be picked up in haste. Moreover, Mr. Preston's term of office had not expired, and that adds something to the bad manners of his removal. It is evident that the demands of politics caused his retirement, yet, as we have said, his successor, Mr. Roberts, seems to be an uncommonly good selection if for any reason a change was to be made. We observe in the *State Register* of Des Moines of January 22 an address by Mr. Roberts before the Iowa Bankers' Association on "Banks and Modern Business," which evinces much careful study and accurate knowledge of the subject of which he treats, and a very pointed way of presenting his ideas to his hearers.

The *Wool and Cotton Reporter* tells us that "the foreign woollen manufacturers are, for the most part, in excellent spirits," are buying "large amounts of wool," are not conscious as yet that "they have lost our market," and are looking forward to a profitable business in light woollens in China and Japan. The rascals even think they will "sell us large orders in the future." Under these circumstances the *Reporter* naturally warns "American manufacturers to be on their guard." It is not this prophecy which affects us, but the cheerfulness of these scoundrels. We always thought one of the most attractive effects of a good tariff was to make foreigners feel miserable. We have now what all concerned admit is a model tariff, which has been in operation over half a year, and yet a leading trade journal tells us "the foreign manufacturers are in excellent spirits." The deficit is bad enough, but we should think this foreign cheerfulness would fill poor Dingley's cup to overflowing. Foreign misery is as essential a part of the protective system as home prosperity. There can be no true prosperity at home without weeping foreign operatives and "busted" manufacturers. Is this a consequence of having the tariff lower prices about this time?

The present comparative quiet in Cuban affairs should not blind any one to the really critical nature of the situation. Two things are absolutely necessary for Governor-General Blanco to do, and to do quickly. One is to set up anew the autonomous government; the other is to reduce the insurgent bands to submission. What progress is he making in either? Very little. The elections which were to have been held in February are now adjourned till April. It was felt, doubtless, that in the present condition of the island to hold a general election would be a little too facical. Occasional successes over the insurgents in the field are reported; here and there a rebel leader has been induced to surrender. But the Eastern provinces seem to be almost at the mercy of the revolutionists, and everywhere else roving bands are to be found. The death of the insurgent general reported on Friday took place in the province of Havana itself, which Gen. Weyler had asserted to be "completely pacified." Señor Canalejas, the ex-Minister who has been studying the situation in Cuba, goes to Spain to report that there is no immediate prospect of ending the war, as the insurgents have the means to prolong their resistance. At any rate, there is no likelihood of the war being ended before the beginning of the next rainy season in May, and if it is not, President McKinley, if we may believe what Mr. Hitt said in his name, is committed to a policy of intervention.

The Committee of Fifty-three, speaking for the anti-machine Republicans of the city, has put forth a statement in regard to "harmony" which is one of the most encouraging documents laid before this community in recent times. What could be more refreshing than the following passage, which is the keynote of the deliverance?

> "The machine and all sympathizers with it may as well understand, now and for all time, that the supporters of the new movement can no longer be fooled by worn-out tricks and promises of reform within and by the machine. We have walked too often into their parlor. We believe in treating the present machine in the same manner in which honest men treat rogues. Therefore, all talk of 'harmony,' so far as it can affect us, is absolutely wasted."

That puts the movement against Platt on the only basis upon which success is possible. He and his associates are not politicians in the proper sense of the term, but rogues, political gamblers, who use the party name only to enable them so far to conceal their real trade as to permit it to succeed. As Cornelius Bliss said of Platt, they act deliberately "so as to make it impossible for self-respecting men to be allied with them even for a good purpose." When all the honest men of the Republican party reach the position now taken by the Committee of Fifty-three, that they cannot hold any relations with rogues, cannot even treat with them, the end of Platt as a power for evil in politics will have arrived.

John Morley, as was to be expected, has vigorously assailed Mr. Chamberlain's plan of giving a "grant in aid" to the West Indian sugar-planters. He characterizes the proposal as only one more attempt of the Conservative Government to bestow a dole upon favored classes at the expense of the taxpayers. First it was the landlords, then the Church of England schools, now it is the sugar-planters. This is going only a little further in the way of condemnation than did that stout supporter of the Government, the London *Times*, which said that it was not "greatly enamoured of the system of doles to which, by some fatality, the present Government has resorted with unusual frequency." But the "fatality" is only that of following a leader who makes all sorts of grandiloquent promises to all sorts of people, and then asks them to let him off with a small cash payment on account. Chamberlain may yet drop his grant in aid as abruptly as he did his famous imperial Zollverein, to which Lord Rosebery referred in a recent speech, saying that it behooved the audience to observe that solemnity which was expected in the presence of a corpse.

The frequent recurrence of fights in legislatures is not helping the reputation of democratic government. The scenes in the Austrian Reichsrath were scandalous enough, but the last prolonged fight in the Assembly in Paris was worse than any. But the sort of dry rot which seems to have overtaken nearly all democratic legislatures does not act on ours in the same way. In Europe they fall to, and smash each other offhand. Ours do not feel enough to indulge in any violence about anything. They sit still till they hear from their boss or "old man." The last thing in the world they think of is fighting. Nobody could get them into a rage. We have no "scenes" in our legislatures, because there is little or no debate. There can no more be confusion in our legislatures than in a man-of-war. Every man has his duties assigned to him, and knows exactly what he is to do. Then, in the minds of our politicians there is neither envy, hatred, nor malice. Every man knows his duty, and is content with the place his boss has assigned him. The idea of having any views of his own which he cannot change or surrender at a moment's notice never enters his head. Why, then, should he fight or assault anybody? This is a feature of the boss system which has not received the attention it deserves. The rows which occur in the foreign parliaments are clearly due to want of discipline.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH.

The rumor that the President intended to put the currency rather than the tariff foremost in his speech at the banquet of the Manufacturers' Association in this city proved to be correct. He not only gave the currency question precedence over the tariff, but, it may fairly be said, made it the sole topic of his discourse. Whatever else he uttered was merely introductory to that subject. His remarks on this theme were highly significant, as accentuating a division of parties which has been a long time under way, and for which the campaign of 1896 was a preparatory step. There has been a struggle within old party lines from the close of the war till the present time over the money question, one faction in either party desiring to prevent the currency from advancing to par with gold, or to debase it after it had reached that standard. The very first political campaign after the war, that of 1868, was of this character. Both parties were rent in the same manner. Gen. Butler headed the soft-money Republicans and George Pendleton the soft-money Democrats. Both were worsted for the time being, but the struggle went on. Other issues, such as reconstruction, carpet-bag government, and force bills and tariff bills, held the parties together. They prevented the disintegration that the money question was tending to produce, but the poison was at no time absent. It worked more persistently and insidiously in the Democratic than in the Republican party, but was prevented from reaching maturity by the wisdom, influence, and courage of a few strong men, notably Horatio Seymour, Samuel J. Tilden, and Grover Cleveland. Two of these men have passed away, and the third is no longer in public life. The Democratic party now stands for nothing else under the sun than a depreciated currency. The debate just closed in the Senate is the best evidence of this. Even the men who supported Palmer and Buckner in 1896 are now yielding more or less to the soft-money pressure behind them.

What has been going on in the Republican party all these years? In the campaign of 1868 it triumphed on a platform which declared in favor of bringing the currency to par with gold, and would probably have remained true to those principles but for the unexpected decline of silver in the world's markets. This accidental circumstance, coupled with the fact that a section of the Union, destined to have considerable political power, was a producer of silver, threw the party off its balance, and it helped to pass the first silver act of 1878 (the Bland-Allison bill) over the veto of President Hayes, Mr. McKinley voting in the affirmative. From that time to this the party has been struggling with itself over the same question in one form or another, but mainly trying to dodge a direct issue, to carry water on both shoulders, to produce a deadlock in one way and another, and to gain time. This is the meaning of the various schemes for international conferences, including the last one, headed by Senator Wolcott. In 1896 there came a time when dodging would no longer serve. The Democratic party, released from the influence of its Seymours, Tildens, and Clevelands, went to the bad altogether, and adopted a platform which, with very little disguise, proposed to reduce the dollar of commerce to fifty cents, with all the disastrous consequences to public and private credit which that act implied. The Republican party was forced to take a stand against that policy, and it did so, but not without violent internal commotion. The representatives of the silver-producing States formally seceded, carrying from the party the electoral votes of that section. The loss was more than balanced by gains in other places, but the cleft in the party was permanent and without remedy.

Mr. McKinley has been slow in recognizing this fact, but he has faced it at last. What he said at the banquet on Thursday evening was that the fight of 1896 must be fought to a finish, that there can be neither backward steps nor standing still. He tells his party friends that the St. Louis platform commits it to a reform of the currency, or at all events to an honest effort to do so. "It will not suffice," he says, "for citizens nowadays to say simply that they are in favor of sound money. That is not enough. The people's purpose must be given the vitality of public law. Better an honest effort with failure than the avoiding of so plain and commanding a duty." For saying something like this we have been accused by well-meaning newspapers in various parts of the country of over-stepping the mark of the St. Louis platform, and of imputing to the convention that adopted it more serious purpose than it ever entertained. We will let that pass, however. It is enough that their own President sees the duties and necessities of the hour in the same light. Of course, he will be accused of inconsistency. His past votes and sayings will be quoted against him, just as those of Secretary Carlisle were; but the battle will not be decided on grounds of individual consistency, but rather on those of national expediency and morality.

We might dwell upon separate phrases and paragraphs in the President's speech, but that would be a task of supererogation. The main purpose is to bring the supporters of the gold standard and of the national honor upon a common platform, to arm them with a common purpose, to drive all cowards out of their skulking-places, and compel them to take one side or the other. This is what the nation has stood most in need of for a full quarter of a century.

THE TYRANNY OF GOLD.

Throughout the debate in the Senate on the Teller resolution, and in many other debates, near and remote, a phrase has been of frequent occurrence implying that certain persons are "trying to fasten the gold standard on the country." This phrase, or something akin to it, was employed by Senator Chandler in the depth of his grief against Secretary Gage. The implication is that Mr. Gage and the opponents of the Teller resolution, including President McKinley, are seeking to introduce something new into our monetary system—that the act of fastening the gold standard on the country not only is wicked in itself, but is a novelty and an innovation. Lest they should create this impression in the minds of people who are liable to be imposed upon by gigantic impudence, we shall recapitulate the facts in the case, although they have often been repeated in our columns.

The truth is that the gold standard was fastened upon the country sixty-four years ago. It has been our monetary standard *de facto* for that length of time, and for twenty-five years it has been the standard both *de jure* and *de facto*. Consequently, Secretary Gage and the opponents of the Teller resolution, and President McKinley are not aiming to produce a new state of things. They are not seeking to bring about an innovation. On the contrary, they are resisting an innovation which Teller and Bryan are trying to introduce. Whatever merit belongs to conservative aims and tendencies belongs to the former. Whatever discredit attaches to radicalism and the spirit of change is the portion of the latter. We apprehend that it will be found in the long run that conservatism is the stronger force of the two. We believe that when the people come to understand that the silverites are the ones who are seeking to turn things upside down, while charging that intention upon their opponents, these gentry will be put upon the defensive, and that the task of defending themselves will not be an easy one.

Now, we invite their attention to a few well-known and oft-repeated facts of history. Prior to 1834 we had the double standard, as it was called, of gold and silver at the ratio of 15 to 1, which had been adopted in 1792. This was the true commercial ratio at the time when it was adopted, but it did not remain so. The commercial ratio changed, just as the values of wheat and corn vary with reference to each other. An ounce of gold came to be worth more than fifteen ounces of silver. Consequently it was exported or melted or hoarded. It disappeared from circulation. The people were left with an inconveniently heavy and cumbrous coin. They endured this

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

affliction as long as they could. Then in 1834 they changed the legal ratio to 16, although the commercial ratio was about 15½, and although the latter was then the legal ratio of France. It is not to be doubted that the object of adopting the ratio of 16 to 1 was to expel silver from circulation. The so-called "dollar of the fathers" was not wanted. It was driven out indignantly, or at all events effectually. The gold standard was thus established *de facto*. Less than two and a half millions of silver dollars had been coined from the establishment of the mint to 1853. The smaller coins were, however, of proportional weight and fineness with the dollar, and were full legal tender, and of these there had been upwards of $76,000,000 coined.

The next step was taken in 1853. Gold was then plentiful, and the silver dollar had passed out of men's minds as well as out of circulation. The only kind of silver that people were familiar with consisted of foreign coins and our own pieces of a half-dollar and less. In this year Congress passed a law demonetizing these pieces, *i. e.*, prohibiting their coinage on private account and making them legal tender for only $5 in one payment. This was in practice the demonetization of silver, because the act of 1853 demonetized the only silver coins that the people had any practical acquaintance with. A few foreign silver coins had been made legal tender for a limited period, which expired in 1857.

We now come to the "crime of 1873." It seems a long time since we saw that phrase in print or heard it from the lips of any public speaker. Perhaps the silverites have become ashamed of it. Perhaps its falsity has been so thoroughly exposed that it is no longer available. A crime implies the intention to commit a wrongful act. Whether the act of 1873 demonetizing silver was harmful or **not**, it is now sufficiently established in the minds of all candid persons that it was performed without any harmful intent, and simply in the way of public duty and supposed necessity. It came about in a revision of the laws relating to the mint, at a time when the silver dollar was worth two cents more than the gold dollar, and when no person could have anticipated that it would ever be worth less than the gold dollar. So innocent was it of any evil intention that some of the most vociferous silverites of the present day, including Stewart of Nevada, voted for it. The act merely carried to its logical end and conclusion the previous one of 1853 by placing the silver dollar, a practically unknown and unused coin, in the same category as the halves and quarters. A further and necessary step in the act of 1873 was the passage of a clause making the gold dollar the unit of value, in the words following:

"Sec. 14. That the gold coins of the United States shall be a one-dollar piece, which, at the standard weight of 25.8 grains, shall be the unit of value," etc.

The moral character of the act of 1873 is not now in question. We are only dealing with the false and misleading phrase, so often in the mouths of public men, that Secretary Gage and those who agree with him are trying to fasten the gold standard on the country, or, as it is sometimes phrased, are "fastening the tyranny of gold on the country." What is the meaning of the words we have quoted from an act of Congress passed nearly a quarter of a century ago? What is a unit of value? Manifestly it is the one thing in comparison with which all other values are to be measured and determined. It can have no other significance. Has there been any law passed since that time repealing or changing it or making anything else the unit of value? Nobody pretends so. Various attempts have been made to change it, notably in the last Presidential election. All such attempts have failed. It follows that the "tyranny of gold" has been upon us since 1834 *de facto*, and since 1873 both *de facto* and *de jure*. It follows also that the phrase imputing to certain persons a design to fasten this tyranny on the country is untruthful in its implications. It conveys the idea that those persons have some revolutionary design in dealing with the currency, whereas they are merely standing by and defending a condition which has been in force for two generations. The number of men who have seen more years than the gold standard has been in force in the United States are relatively few. They are those, and only those, who are more than sixty-four years of age. The only revolutionists and subverters of our ancient and established monetary system are the silverites themselves.

Something might be said about the phrase "tyranny of gold," implying that gold is a cruel despot and an injury to mankind. It is strange that we never heard of this tyrant until silver fell below par. If the despotism of gold is so cruel to the human race, it is strange that all other nations one by one are rushing to its embraces. Since the controversy became hot in the United States, Italy, Austria, Rumania, Chili, Japan, Russia, and even San Domingo have welcomed the tyrant, and now India is taking steps to the same end. The tyranny of gold is of the same nature as the tyranny of railroads in comparison with lumber-wagons, of telegraphs and telephones in comparison with post-boys, of gas and electric lights in comparison with tallow dips, of the United States in comparison with Mexico and China, of coined money as against wampum, of civilization in general as against savagery.

LOVE OF COUNTRY.

Mrs. Siddons, said Brougham, in reply to Talleyrand's question if Fox had not been *très occupé* with her, was too great to inspire affection; the East India Company might perhaps have dared to love her—nothing short of that. Of a truth, the magnitude of an object does affect the sentiments with which we regard it. Lovers dilate on the greatness of their love, but all tongues are full of the diminutives which they apply to its objects, and his suit would doubtless prosper ill who should address his beloved with the superlatives of dimension. The children of Israel were a stiff-necked people, but it cannot be called unnatural that they should seek some being more commensurate with their religious emotions than the awful Jehovah; a golden calf, even, or a brazen serpent might be much more comfortably worshipped than a deity whose greatness oppressed their imaginations. The worship of the Virgin Mary is not permitted to Protestants; but it would be uncharitable to deny that many millions of humble Christians have found the love of the Virgin something much more compatible with their limited capacities than that of an infinite being whom no human eye has ever seen or can ever see, and whose very perfections seem to elevate him beyond all relation to the petty turmoil of human passions.

If patriotism be defined as the love borne to a country by its inhabitants, it would thus seem reasonable to recognize the existence of some relation between extension on the one hand and intention on the other. There have been people who professed to love all men equally, but, granting their sincerity, we may question the heartiness of their attachment to millions and thousands of millions of their fellow-creatures whom they have never seen, and who would perhaps decline to reciprocate their amiable sentiments if the existence of such sentiments were disclosed to them. Love is no doubt an immaterial essence, but it must be susceptible of some kind of quantitative estimate, and the most large-hearted philanthropist can hardly maintain that he loves a million human beings severally with the same intensity with which another man loves a dozen. Established principles of psychology settle the matter, and it could be settled *à posteriori* as well. If we take a look into history, we find that the small states can make altogether the best case as regards the patriotism of their citizens. The Jews were plainly better patriots than the Egyptians or the Assyrians; the Greeks than the Persians. Lacedæmon was a very small state, but its soldiers have an exalted name for patriotism, and the Athenians were a notoriously patriotic people. There was more patriotism under the early Roman republic than under the later one, and under the Republic than under the Empire. The Chinese empire is perhaps the greatest in population in the world,

LICENSED-TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but it does not look as if the ordinary Chinaman were affected with patriotism in a very intense form. How much patriotism is there in the "vast and squalid empire" of Russia, compared with that in France, or England, or even Ireland? Is there any people of its size so dangerous to attack as the Swiss?

There is, perhaps, a dim metaphysical notion that patriotism consists in the love of one's country, rather than its inhabitants. Such is probably the idea of those newspaper writers and statesmen who profess to be inflamed with patriotism, while they are at the same time busily denouncing one another and large classes of their fellow-citizens as scoundrels. The sincerity of their feeling is best known to themselves, but if they have any affection for their countrymen, it must be confined to those who agree with them. But it would never do to define such affection as patriotism; the case would be worse than that of the Irish peasantry—

"fighting like divils for conciliation,
And hating each other for the love of God."

He who sets up as a patriot must yield his own tastes and preferences, and comprehend all his countrymen in the broad expanse of his affection. The Almighty, we are told, hates sin, but loves sinners; but no mortal can be allowed to pose as a patriot by proclaiming that he loves his country, but hates all his countrymen, or all that do not agree with his views. He must save his hatred for foreigners, and make his love cover all his fellow-citizens; otherwise, the most perplexing distinctions would be introduced. For, if a patriot denounces large classes of his countrymen, they may denounce him, and how can the dear People distinguish the genuine from the spurious article?

Since we Americans now number seventy millions, it can hardly be denied that our patriotism is in danger of becoming too diluted. It requires some effort to arouse the patriotic glow over a horde of Italians, Russians, Jews, Bohemians, Poles, Greeks, and Armenians just landed on our shores, but we must open our hearts to them, for they are just as much Americans as the rest of us so soon as they are naturalized. Length of stay counts for nothing. Some of our loudest patriots are of recent arrival, and if we are to take account of pedigrees, where should most of us be compared with the negroes and the "Indians not taxed"? If they can embrace us with patriotic emotion, we surely ought to fall on the necks of more recent immigrants; and if we do not love the negroes and Indians and the Populists of the South and West, how can we expect the recent importations to develop true "Americanism"? Such requirements, however, may pass beyond the powers of ordinary people, and even stretch those of newspaper and congressional patriots to a painful degree. Before enlarging our borders and taking in a considerable number of people of heterogeneous race, it would be prudent to allow our stock of patriotism to catch up with the demands upon it. When excessive strains are put on love, it is sometimes converted into aversion, and it cannot be denied that a country may become populated with individuals largely of an unlovable description. It is encouraging to find that the vociferous patriots are not having it all their own way in Congress, and that one leader, whose gifts of wit and good sense have made his lack of political courage and foresight a regret to his country, should openly say: "I don't want Cuba and Hawaii. I've got more country now than I can love."

THE MAYORAL CURIOSITY.

We must express our great satisfaction at the performances now going on daily at the city hall. To make Tammany and the Tammany régime thoroughly understood by simple-minded people, especially the people who proposed to "coöperate" with it, we needed just such a Mayor as Robert Van Wyck. No amount of speaking and writing about Tammany would do in ten years for the elucidation of our situation, what he has done in one month. Ten years ago, when Tammany for the first time elected a real Tammany man—none of your "prominent merchants," or Chamber of Commerce "hypocrites," but a genuine Boy, fresh from the barroom and the race track—we took the liberty of pointing out that the city had entered on a new phase in its downward course, that simply bad and inefficient government had at last ended in an attack on our civilization itself.

The election of Grant, we held, and hold, was the first sign that our rulers were not going any longer to be content with corruption, bad police, and general maladministration, but were about to make an assault on the very foundation of modern American civilization—the necessity of science, education, training, and experience to national progress. The triumph of the theory that ignorant and inexperienced men were fit for the highest offices of state, that character was of no consequence, and that offices were simply "plums," was probably the worst blow that was ever struck at popular government, and it was struck in New York, A. D. 1888. It, however, produced no reaction. Grant was reëlected, and one of his confederates succeeded him through the votes of many decent people. In order to get rid of the Tammany régime, to have the great principles of modern civilization reaffirmed by the second city in the world, we had to have "the carnival of crime" that was exposed by the Lexow committee. In due time, after the effect produced by the "carnival" had worn out, we had Tammany back again, in defiance of press, pulpit, and platform. We found last November that we were dealing with a foe against whom all the instruments of persuasion were powerless.

For these reasons, because writing and talking apparently have no more influence in the city, we are grateful to Robert Van Wyck for giving us an actual demonstration of what Tammany rule, in its full development, means. It chose for its latest Mayor a judge of a minor court of small jurisdiction, more known for his conviviality than for his law or justice, with apparently no knowledge of city affairs, and without even the civility of manner for which Americans of every class are noted. There probably never have been in the civilized world such exhibitions as are going on in the city hall every day. There is probably no mining camp or low lodging-house in which can be witnessed such displays of unprovoked rudeness to any one as Van Wyck displays to high officials who come to see him on business. He is paid $15,000 a year for being what is known and has been known for ages as a "Mayor"—that is, a man who administers a city with a knowledge of its affairs, who represents it with dignity and urbanity to other officials or to visiting strangers, and keeps quiet about things he does not understand, knowing that any exposure of his own ignorance reflects discredit on his constituents. Not one of these obligations, however, does this Van Wyck acknowledge. He never appeared in public during the canvass, for reasons which are now very plain; but in this he was within his right. His seclusion was the affair of those who voted for him. But, once he secured office, he came under the ordinary obligations attaching to his office to keep sober, or else to carry his liquor meekly; to dress decently, to treat every one coming to his office on business with civility; to remember constantly his representative character, that he is not simply an ignorant, unmannerly, and convivial Dutchman, but, by the grace of God, the chief executive officer of no mean city, and therefore responsible for its fair fame among the civilized nations of the earth.

We, for our part, are glad he is disregarding these obligations. He is saving us the trouble of exposing Tammany and denouncing Tammany, work of which we were weary years ago. He is bringing home to the people of the city what Tammany really is, in a way in which no articles, or pamphlets, or indignation meetings could do it. He takes the place of Mugwumps, Garoos, City Clubs, Good Government Clubs, leaflets, sermons, and all the paraphernalia of free, civilized, and Christian government. He stands forth as a real Tammany Mayor, without any ornament or disguise. This is what we have been seeking for years and what both parties have been helping to procure us. No

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

better illustration of what "the party" lunacy brings a people to, could be devised. We are "the heirs of all the ages, foremost in the files of time," and a nice figure we cut to-day. We have to submit to the vulgar insolence of one of our own officials, who plays the barbarian to us in such fashion that the only thing he could further do to complete our humiliation would be to strip to the waist and sit at his desk in red ochre and feathers.

THE VACATION SCHOOLS FOR FRENCH IN FRANCE AND SWITZERLAND.

YALE UNIVERSITY, January 17, 1898.

Vacation schools for French are of late being founded in considerable number in Europe. They are for the benefit of foreigners, and the natives are debarred from attending them. I had occasion to visit most of these schools the past summer, and printed reports from several have now come in. The courses given are usually divided into two series; as, at Paris, one includes the month of July and the second the month of August, and at Geneva one extends from the 17th of July to the 30th of August, and a shorter one follows from October 1 to the 21st. Each is complete in itself; they mean to cover about the same ground, but at the same time the texts and other matters are not duplicated, so that any one might profitably follow both. I could not help being favorably impressed with the doings at all of these schools alike. Too much should not be expected from so brief a period of study, but all of them present an excellent opportunity to find out what the language is in its real dignity and importance, in its traditions and its literary development, as contrasted with the light smattering—to which no disparagement, as far as it goes—usually got from the ordinary French teacher abroad.

The course at Geneva, founded in 1892, claims priority in date. It was established by Prof. Bouvier of the Faculty of Letters of the University. He had been lecturer in French at the University of Berlin, and while there had seen the demand there was for supplying some such facilities as this, especially to the native instructors. It is now the requirement in the progressive European countries, as it will perhaps become the requirement some time with us, that the instructor in a modern language shall be able to conduct a recitation in that tongue itself. Some of those in attendance at Paris, during the last summer, were Russian and Bulgarian teachers sent at the expense of their own governments. The majority seemed to be connected with education; the college principal from Copenhagen would elbow the English governess from Allahabad; but there were also army officers, doctors, editors, and some business men.

The vacation school at Paris under the auspices of the Alliance Française, though founded only in 1894, has become the most important of all, as is natural enough, considering the advantages of the great metropolis. The Alliance Française is a patriotic association—with many distinguished persons in its management, and branches in all parts of the world—for the propagation of the French language. It seems to be a pretty lively part of that latent "conspiracy" which Brunetière affirms the French writers have entered into, from the beginning of their literature, to make the French language the second mother tongue of all mankind. So, too, Baron de Coubertin, acting upon a like impulse, has established valuable prizes for essays upon French subjects in our leading American universities. There is something rather fine about this plan of spreading the fame of one's country abroad. It seems worth any quantity of the bullying method by "pike and gun," and might give the cheap Jingoes food for reflection.

The exercises were held in the bright new edifice of the École Coloniale, which is on the quiet Avenue de l'Observatoire, close by the Luxembourg gardens. The cheery look of the building was a pleasant augury that was not belied by the event; from the first a very cordial and considerate spirit, which is by no means the invariable rule at Paris, was manifested towards the large group of strangers. There was a desire to entertain as well as instruct. After the speeches at the opening session, on July 1, it was announced that there was going to be, among other things, a shower of theatre tickets. Although this shower never reached such dimensions that it was precisely necessary to put up an umbrella against it, there were in fact a considerable number of theatre tickets distributed. Each nationality chose its own syndic, who dealt with the central authority in this and other matters. The ladies of the student company were received socially by wives of several cabinet ministers. There were 370 persons in attendance, considerably more than half of them women. The August session drew together 170 more. They represented every sort of nationality: Russians, Danes, Hollanders, Italians, Bulgarians, Czechs, were all there. The bare list shows the cosmopolitan character of the assemblage, and its great possibilities, in consequence, for good. Germans were largely in the majority, as I found to be the case in all these schools. They were 216 out of the 370. There were 54 English and 44 Americans; the Russians followed next in order.

A busy round of lectures began, at the rate of about three a day, with conversation classes by small groups of persons, in the evening, and also (thrown in, during the day) visits, under a competent conductor, to the monuments and other art works of Paris. The French language of the seventeenth century and of the nineteenth were treated of, Gallicisms and popular speech; classic literature, and contemporary literature; Lamartine, by himself; the dramatic theories of Diderot; comedy after Molière; the Romantic drama. There were besides recitations in diction and dramatic reading and in elocution and pronunciation. The series is divided into two courses, elementary and advanced, according to the ability of the student, and there is also a common course, open to all alike, treating of the institutions of France and of art. At the end of the term, examinations were held and diplomas issued. As to the matter of expense, it is moderate: the whole two hundred exercises, of all sorts, can be subscribed for for the sum of 150 francs, or twenty-five tickets can be taken for 25 francs—this is required as a minimum—and, after that, such single tickets as may be desired.

Prof. Brunot of the University, author of an historical grammar of the language, was the lecturer best known among scholars. He is spoken of, too, as the soul of this work, on account of his great interest in it from the first. He gave us his regular product in all the minute details, so that the result was as if one had had a month's section or supply of what he would have taken a year or more to develop at the Sorbonne. René Doumic of the Lycée Stanislas, but also the distinguished literary critic of the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, was the most interesting of the lecturers. The amphitheatre was large—for the purpose in view—and the front seats were much in demand, but he was the one who could always be heard without difficulty. It is gratifying to know this, as he is coming here in the spring to lecture at some of our universities, following in the footsteps of Brunetière, last year. He seems to have formed himself upon Brunetière in many ways, but his sentences are much shorter than Brunetière's, and hence easier to follow. He has also much humor. He dwelt on the need of actually being in a foreign country and knowing it, in order to try to understand its literature. All the speakers were not as entertaining as M. Doumic; some of them mumbled under their breath, and some of them were dull. But this was to be said of them all, that it was improving to listen to them, no matter what their material or their delivery, for one does not master talking French by listening to only a single speaker, any more than translating it by reading only a single author.

The conversation classes were really very well done. I could not but admire the polite ingenuity with which the bright young professor, in one of those sections, combated the reluctance (or the native slowness) of some of his auditors in being led into talk. Some of them had had very little previous practice in speaking. "And you, monsieur," he would say, extending a courteously appealing hand towards, for instance, the dark South American, "will you tell us something about the system of suffrage in your country?" "And you, mademoiselle," again, to the blonde Swedish girl, whose pleasant high color at once became more rosy still with a flush of modesty, "have you been to the theatre sometimes in Paris?" The theatre was always a resource; Richepin's play "Le Chemineau" was on at the time, at the Odéon, and nearly everybody had seen it. He would have the plot of it narrated and commented upon. Again, Zola, what with the differing moral ideas from so many parts of the globe, proved a source of such lively discussion that all self-consciousness was, for the time being, thrown off.

The final examinations consisted of the writing of a dissertation, in French, on some subject based upon the work gone over. One of those for the superior course was: "What was the end aimed at by Molière in writing 'Tartuffe'?" One of those for the elementary course: "An interview between the King and a critic belonging to the classic school, who wished him to forbid the representation of Victor Hugo's plays." I note that but one American passed the examination for a diploma, while sixteen diplomas were awarded to the English; but I think this merely shows that the Americans have not yet begun to enter for the examinations; they content themselves, for the present, with the incidental improvement.

The Alliance Française issues a list of boarding-houses for its students. I visited many of these *pensions de famille*, and—perhaps from having formed at an early day

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the idea that living abroad should be both cheap and somewhat romantic—I cannot say that I found them attractive. They were not always very cheap, nor cheerful in outlook, nor free from odors as if the drainage had not been properly attended to; and then again it might happen that they would be so full of miscellaneous foreigners, or of other Americans, that very little good French would be heard there. Still, it must be possible to find the right sort of accommodations; I can only say that one will have to use all the ingenuity he is master of in getting himself agreeably placed.

The only other vacation school in France at present, though Grenoble is talking of having one soon, is that at Nancy, belonging also to the Alliance Française. Nancy has 80,000 people, and retains many of the stately features that belonged to it when it was the court-city of the Dukes of Lorraine. One is quite astonished, on alighting there, to see all those palaces, statues, gardens, fountains, triumphal arches, and high gilded gratings. Charles the Bold of Burgundy, that historical bull in a china-shop, was killed under its walls. The vine-clad slopes about it make pleasing scenery, and, so far as surroundings are concerned, I do not see why one could not be quite content to live and study in the quiet town of Nancy. I used to feel all along at Paris that the ideal vacation school should be held where one could combine some of the pleasures of the country with the purpose in hand; indeed, that was the basis of the search on which I set out. The lessons were given at the University. There are but five a week, and, as at Paris, the price comes to a franc a lesson. I found about thirty persons comfortably assembled about a long table, with the professor at one end. There were two English and one American, the latter a young woman from Arkansas. The course was followed by seventy persons in all last year. It is not here merely a vacation course; it runs throughout the year—as the prospectus announces, "même pendant les vacances." The examinations take place in April, July, and October, respectively. The University is open gratis to those who may desire to attend there, the whole certainly making an excellent opportunity. Board and lodging is quoted as from 100 to 150 francs a month.

I have said that at Grenoble they are planning a school of the same kind. They desire to have it throughout the year, as at Nancy. They would be very glad, too, to draw foreign students to their University. This small city, of 60,000 inhabitants, will most likely have a programme of studies arranged for the coming season, and then it should present great advantages. My attention was first called to it by the statement of Michel Bréal, the distinguished philologist of the Collège de France, that, if he had his life to live over again, "he would be a student nowhere but at Grenoble, within sight of the Alps, beside the swift waters of the Isère." I spent some three weeks there, and came to know it very thoroughly. It is the centre of a variety of charming excursions. You have Chambéry close by, with the house of Madame de Warens and Rousseau; Aix-les-Bains, with its stir of fashion; the Lakes of Laffrey, where Napoleon first fell in with the Royalist troops on his escape from Elba; the springs of Uriage, and the remarkable glaciers of Bourg d'Oisans. I found M. Marcel Reymond (who, with M. Zeller, the very agreeable rector of the University, has this movement especially in charge) living at quite a little earthly paradise, his summer home, up in the village of St.-Ismier, embowered in rose and fruit trees, and looking off to the snow-topped range of the Belledonne. It was thought that students might be placed by twos or threes in private families, at moderate prices. Another idea was that the fine buildings of the Lycée should be used for this purpose during the vacation; they could be free, however, only after the month of July.

Grenoble is fortunate in the fresh, beautiful edifice of its University, uniform in architecture with the Public Library and the Prefecture, around a handsome square. I was there when it was dedicated by the President of France, under the new law which gives each university a separate existence; but lately they were mere "academies" of the central direction at Paris. The professors were very brilliant in their rich gowns—crimson, scarlet, violet, or canary-yellow, according to the faculty, with the *épitoge*, barred in ermine, over the shoulder. They surpassed even the gold-laced generals; learning here does not leave to the less worthy occupations the monopoly of mundane pomp. There are some 600 students; the faculties of law and science are stronger than the others. Grenoble has a Committee of Initiative, charged with advancing the material interests of the place, and a town of our own Far West could scarce be more active in distributing circulars, to draw in new population. What with this, a students' committee for the benefit of strangers, and the hospitable disposition of the professors, an American going there to study would certainly find himself well received, and in such a place he ought to be able to turn his time to very good account, both in the language and in other ways.

From there I went on to Geneva. I found some two hundred and twenty members in the summer course, with every appearance of being actively interested. The greater number were still Germans. There were but two from England—more exactly, Scotland—and none from America, though there have been Americans in former years. The fees are a little lower than in France—that is, forty francs for six weeks, at the rate of eleven lessons a week. Modern French was rather emphasized in the programme. The purpose here seemed to be to devote as much time as possible to the actual spoken language, leaving out the appeal to French pride and patriotism which was a natural part of the proceedings at Paris. But is Geneva French enough? Why, so far as language is concerned, it is a thoroughly French city; it is the birthplace of many great French writers, the source of most excellent French books, and its leading newspaper, the *Journal de Genève*, is among the best in Europe. The University buildings are in a new part of town, well linked in, however, with the older part that contains the Cathedral and the Hôtel de Ville. They look out with a fine stately air on a lovely public garden, made on the site of some old ramparts.

The studious audience in their spacious halls had a rather more hard-working air than that at Paris; there were many elderly persons present—one grave turbaned Oriental among them—and the shirt-waists and sailor hats might have been a trifle less trim than in Paris. The instruction was imparted by groups of not more than fifty, a feature which made it quite personal, easy, and practical. The instructors, chiefly from the government lycées, were young, energetic, and very competent in their subjects. Prof. Bally dealt very clearly with synonyms and with those slight differences of form that so much puzzle the stranger, and often the native, too—as, *en travers de* and *au travers de*, *s'amuser à* and *s'amuser de*. Prof. Thudicum had in connection with his class in Phonetics a successful Section de Chant, in which the popular ballads of Switzerland were sung; singing being an excellent promoter of accurate pronunciation. Prof. Bouvier, the founder and director, was admirable. Still young, of a fine and thoughtful appearance, a man of ideas and an excellent speaker, he had, too, that obligingness of manner, combined with force and efficiency in management, that constitutes the highest type of deportment for the civilized man. His own department was the French literature, with classes in "Analytical Reading" and in "Improvisation and Discussion." He read French poetry beautifully, without any of the cheap artifices of the elocutionist. The members of the school used to hold social reunions among themselves, and at the end there was a banquet, and Labiche's comedy "Les Deux Timides" was played. Saturdays were kept free for excursions, and surely there was no lack of excursions when you could go one day, for instance, to see Voltaire's fine château at Ferney, and another down the lake to Madame de Staël's charming home at Coppet.

Further along on the lake, at Lausanne, housed in the new chemical laboratory of the quaint University, high on the very steep hill, is another of the vacation schools. And still another is at Neuchâtel, on the lake of the same name, the town where Agassiz was once professor. I have no report on the latter, and I fear to transcend due bounds if I add more than a word or two about that of Lausanne. Some 3,000 English people, it is said, live at Lausanne, and by learning to deftly catch the tramways and the cable road down to the shore at Ouchy, have adapted themselves to the back-breaking hill, which, with all its picturesqueness, at first sight seems quite impossible. The courses here were two of three weeks each, but with fifteen hours a week, and the numbers were modest. If ten students make the demand for more than is contained in the programme, a special seminary will be formed for them. The programme, however, covered a pretty wide range—comparative literature, a comparative study of French and German, the movement of ideas in contemporary France, questions of modern history, and the like. The latter, by Prof. Rossier, was made, through discussions, as stimulating as possible to conversation; but considerable tact was sometimes necessary to avoid the rise of unpleasant feelings between rival nationalities.

WILLIAM HENRY BISHOP.

ROSSETTI AND MILLAIS.—II.

LONDON, January 3, 1898.

If Rossetti was the poet of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, sharing with the others his great gift of imagination, Millais was the painter, the perfect craftsman. Of this, you can never have the shadow of a doubt from the moment you look at the surpris-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing little "Cupid Crowned with Flowers," the most romantic flight of his whole working life perhaps, painted when he was twelve years old (?), until you turn in despair from the popular "Cherry Ripes" and "Bubbles," with which, in his maturity, he stooped to pander to the public taste. Even in the worst of the banalities he produced with so much misdirected ease, you will come upon a beautiful bit of color, a lovely bit of form, a painter-like quality, that makes the foolish Christmas supplement a tragedy to you. So terrible does it seem that the accomplished painter he was should have been willing to prostitute his powers and play down to the populace. The collection displays him in all his strength and his weakness—the strength that lay in his extraordinary talent or genius, the weakness that came largely from his curious want of what I must call, for lack of a better word, pictorial sense. Where Rossetti hesitated and bungled, he triumphed, for in paint he found ever his one and only sympathetic form of expression. But where Rossetti looked out upon the world with the eyes of a poet, Millias saw things just as they are, all plain matter-of-fact prose. When left to himself, his portraits and landscapes were seldom more than exact transcripts of nature, making no demand on the intelligence or the imagination.

In the beginning, he fell under the spell of Rossetti. That he was ready to fall under anybody's spell seems likely. A "Cymon and Iphigenela" I have now seen for the first time, ascribed to the years 1848-'51, when he was painting the most characteristic of his Pre-Raphaelite pictures, is absurdly like a sham Mulready or Etty, while a little "Conjurer," presumably an early work, though the date is not given, is strongly reminiscent of Bonington and Delacroix. But Rossetti's influence happened to be dominant; it asserts itself in the "Mariana" and "Isabella," in the "Ariel" and the "Ophelia," in the "Blind Girl" and the "Sir Isumbras," while the "Carpenter's Shop" suggests Holman Hunt. But, the subject or motive once found or borrowed, Millais could carry it out with a power and distinction all his own. Rossetti never surpassed the brilliancy of color in the "Mariana," nor the exquisite detail of the embroidery on the table, the jewelled girdle about her waist, the dim lamp before the shrine, the gay flower-garden seen through the window. He never approached the truth of the little hillside village under the vivid rainbow arch that makes a background for the "Blind Girl," or the blossoms and foliage bordering the stream where Ophelia floats, chanting snatches of old tunes. The "Girlhood of Virgin Mary" is not more naïve than the "Carpenter's Shop," nor the "Sir Galahad" more deliberately primitive than the "Isabella." These early Millaises are the masterpieces of Pre-Raphaelitism, and, at the Academy, if they are not hung in chronological order, they are placed so close together that they can be seen almost by turning your head, certainly by walking a few paces: an opportunity for study which will never be offered again, at least to our generation.

But the bewildering thing is that, even at the time Millais was busy painting these great pictures, he was perpetrating such odious sentimental trivialities as the "Order of Release" and the "Rescue" and the "Conclusion of Peace." This last, but little known, luckily, represents a family scene, and reeks with all that is sickliest and most cloying in early Victorian sentiment, so indelicate in its self-conscious delicacy that you hurry away from it with something like a feeling of shame. And when, gradually, he threw off altogether the romance he had borrowed from Rossetti, this sentiment clung to him, asserting itself with more and more force in the many subject pictures that have delighted the English Christmas audience, so that you cannot help asking if, in the "Conclusion of Peace" rather than in the "Mariana" or the "Ophelia," you have not the real Millais.

He had his splendid intervals, when, for instance, he painted his "Stella" and "Vanessa" in 1868, his portrait of Mrs. Bischoffsheim in 1873, of Mrs. Heugh in 1872. In the "Stella" and "Vanessa" he seems to have exulted, like a Veronese, in the gorgeousness of the gowns he was rendering and their rich, extravagant patterns; he seems to have let himself go, to have abandoned himself to the joy of creation, of seeing the lovely, sensuous forms and lines spring into life at his bidding. There is in them all the quality and color of his first pictures, together with a far greater freedom and force. The "Mrs. Bischoffsheim" has much the same luxuriance, the same gorgeousness; but it has also a stateliness and dignity he too seldom, alas! troubled to give to a portrait. The painting of the flesh, too, is admirable, and the modelling of the large, full, firm neck and bust. It is the very pride of life he has seized and fixed for ever upon his canvas. Then, to learn the range of his powers when he chose to exert them, you have only to leave the "Mrs. Bischoffsheim" for the "Mrs. Heugh," the old withered woman, bent and relaxed under the burden of years, her skin like parchment, marked with innumerable lines and wrinkles, her eyes sunken and watery with age: no less a marvel, no less beautiful in its truth and reverence. It is incomprehensible that the same man could have knocked off without a scruple a whole gallery of cheap tawdry Little Miss Muffetts and Cinderellas; of Salisburys and Gladstones and Tennysons, with the eyes of a Landseer dog, crammed, jammed full of sentiment, of plain, insignificant women, the Frenchman's caricature of the English lady —De Maupassant's "Mees Old Maid." There are exceptions. The "Mr. Gladstone" has some good points, and so has the "Cardinal Newman." Nor can one ever forget the little portrait of Mr. Ruskin, standing in the rocks by a waterfall painted with pre-Raphaelitic minuteness, complete and honest, if untrue. But all the exceptions taken together would not fill a small gallery. I admit that many of the people who came to Millais to be painted must have appeared to him discouraging enough; but the really great artist, with respect for his art or his reputation, will find an interest in ugliness, or else not paint it. Rembrandt made a masterpiece of a Jew in rags, Velasquez of an Infanta in crinoline. But Millais did not care, and he was sure the British public neither knew nor cared so long as it saw his signature; and, understanding the tastes of his patrons, he gave them what they wanted.

There are, of course, other pictures not to be overlooked altogether: the "Yeoman of the Guard," now belonging to the National Gallery; the "Eve of St. Agnes," theatrical, but preserving something of the early truth and loveliness of detail; the "Esther," with its marvellous rendering of silks and embroideries. Of his landscapes, famous as several are, I say nothing, for the reason that, to see them now at the Academy, is to acknowledge that Millais was not a landscape painter. There are here and there very charming passages: the hedge in the "Old Garden," the reeds in the "Sir Isumbras," the flowers in the "Ophelia," the rocks in the "Mr. Ruskin," the hillside in the "Blind Girl." But, as a rule, nature provided him merely with subjects of study. He put down what he happened to see, without any effort to select or leave out, without any sense of beautiful line, of decoration, of composition. For effect, he depended on the sword-blade cypresses and pines black against the sky that he and Mr. Leader got from Linnell, and that are supposed somehow to express pathos; or else on the scrawly, wriggly tree-forms that are the backbone of Fred Walker.

The drawings are disappointing. One knows the fine work Millais did as an illustrator, but most of his illustrations were drawn on the wood block and cut to pieces by the engraver. The "Pearl of Great Price" is here; it was redrawn on wood for the Parables, and engraved by Dalziel, and is the only unengraved drawing for this book that I can remember. There is also a "St. Agnes' Eve," another version of the design used in Moxon's Tennyson. And two or three studies and sketches complete the very imperfect display of important drawings.

Finally, I must say a word in praise of the most excellent catalogue published by the Royal Academy. It contains a chronological list of the pictures that, hereafter, all students of Millais will find indispensable.

N. N.

Correspondence.

THE LOUD BILL.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In a recent issue, you made the following statements in regard to the Loud bill:

"Yet that bill was defeated because powerful private interests were affected by it. These private interests kept a lobby at Washington. They had 'pulls' with Senators and Representatives. The public, who foot these unnecessary bills, do not send anybody to Washington to represent their common interests in a special but only in a general way, and so the abuse which the Loud bill seeks to eradicate goes on, and the parasites who fatten on the postal revenues are undisturbed.

Since these statements are liable to give the public a wrong impression of the merits of the bill, and of the character of those who oppose its passage, I beg of you a small amount of space for reply. If you will kindly refer to reports of the Loud bill hearings before the Senate committee at Washington last winter, you will find that private interests were represented on both sides of this question, and not on one alone. Among other powerful interests which sent able advocates to Washington to work for the bill were press organizations claiming to represent three-fourths of all the daily circulation of newspapers in America, and three-fourths of the circulation of legitimate agricultural papers. On the one side you will find those private interests which seek to secure a mo-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nopoly of low postal rates, and on the other those which, claiming equal rights, object to being discriminated against. You will find favoring the bill, on the ground that it is opposed to those who issue libraries, the ——, a paper which gives for 10 cents 9¾ ounces of advertisements and 3¼ ounces of reading matter; and on the other side of the question you will find the publishers of Longfellow's 'Evangeline' in the Riverside Literature Series, which contains 4⅜ ounces of reading matter and no advertisements, with the claim that good literature without advertisements should receive as low postal rates as papers which devote 72 per cent. of their space to advertising matter.

You say that the public do not send any one to Washington to represent their common interests, except in a general way; this is true, and it is to be regretted that our State Superintendents of Public Instruction, our college presidents, and other educators cannot go to Washington and state their views on this important subject. Mr. Booker T. Washington, the representative of the colored people of the United States, says:

"In my opinion the passage of the Loud bill, now before Congress, will prove a great disadvantage to education, especially in the southern part of our country, where our people are now beginning to take advantage of the cheap rate at which literature is now being furnished by the various publishing houses. The passage of the Loud bill would set back the South, in my opinion, in its educational work most effectively, and I very earnestly hope that the said bill will not pass."

A. S. Draper, President of the University of Illinois, says:

"It seems to me there is but one side of the question presented. The postal laws should, so far as practicable, discriminate in favor of standard literature and of reprints of the same, as against matter which is of only passing interest or infinitely worse."

Of ten State superintendents of public instruction who have been heard from, nine have expressed themselves as emphatically opposed to the passage of the bill. W. R. Jackson, the Nebraska State Superintendent of Schools, says:

"As I see the matter now, the enactment of the bill into law will cause a great setback to the diffusion of choice and wholesome literature among the people of this great country."

The educators referred to above represent a very large portion of the population of the United States.

Since I am one of those who have appeared at Washington before the Senate committee in opposition to the Loud bill, and, therefore come under the ban of your criticism, I beg leave to give very briefly my reasons for what I have done. The principal objects of the Loud bill are: (1.) To exclude from the privileges of low postal rates all periodicals "which are merely books or reprints of books, . . . whether they be bound or unbound"; (2) to exclude all sample copies, and (3) to require each periodical to "have a legitimate list of subscribers who voluntarily order and pay for the same." My objection to excluding books and reprints of books is, first, that it was contemplated by the framers of our present law that such material as they contain should receive the highest postal privileges if issued in a periodical form. In the *Congressional Record* of February 3, 1888, may be found a speech of Mr. Cannon, one of the framers of the present law, in which he states that the policy of such legislation is "to encourage the dissemination of sound and desirable reading-matter among the masses of the people of the country at cheap rates, both as to the cost of the books themselves, and as to postage." He goes on to state that under this legislation the best classes of literature, for instance, the Waverley novels, Dickens's works, etc., etc., have been sent out so that they could be sold to the people at 10 cents a volume. Moreover, Judge Devens, when Attorney-General of the United States, decided that the admissibility to pound rates of reprints of books was in accordance with the law.

Since the passage of the present law the taste of our people for good reading-matter has very materially improved, so that to-day there is a large demand for the writings of leading American and English authors in cheap periodical form. In this form will be found the writings of Locke, Pope, Mill, Spencer, Longfellow, Whittier, Emerson, Lowell, Holmes, and many other authors of equal note. Moreover, in periodicals containing reprints there will not be found so large a proportion of trash as is to be found in those papers the contents of which are hastily prepared between two successive issues. Lists of reprints which have been condemned by those who favor the Loud bill have been carefully gone over by one of our prominent librarians, who has found in them a larger percentage of material suitable for permanent library use than would be the case with even the best of our literary magazines. Some of these libraries have become so extensively used by the children of our public schools all over the United States that to exclude them from the privileges of pound rates would be even more detrimental than to exclude the weekly paper or monthly magazine.

Those who oppose the passage of the Loud bill do not wish for any lower rates on second-class matter than the Post-Office Department can afford to give. They are willing that the rates should be doubled or trebled, if necessary, but they are wholly unwilling that material of the sort mentioned above shall be discriminated against, while poorer material, of a more ephemeral nature, or papers consisting almost wholly of advertising sheets, continue to go through the mails at the present low rates.

Other arguments against the passage of the Loud bill have been brought forward, especially in the *Outlook*, pointing out that if the Post-Office Department were to secure the same rates from the railroads as can be obtained by private individuals, the annual deficit would be materially reduced or perhaps entirely eliminated. The argument in favor of the Loud bill appears to be as follows: There is an annual deficit in the Post-Office Department; a deficit is a very bad thing; the Loud bill proposes to do away with this deficit; therefore, we should all favor the Loud bill. The same reasoning would require the amputation of an arm because of a sore finger, but the patient would object, and ask whether there is not some simpler remedy, and that is the question which we who oppose the bill are now asking. We believe that the enforcement of the present law in regard to the exclusion of advertising sheets, coupled with better arrangements with railroads, would more than do away with the present annual deficit. Should this result not be reached, however, we are perfectly willing that the postal rates on second-class matter should be raised as much as may be necessary, our only contention being that the good literature which forms so large a part of so-called libraries, and which is every day increasing in quantity, as compared with poor material, should not be compelled to make way for other material of an inferior quality.

I regret that from lack of space I cannot take up the question of sample copies and other matters in regard to which much might be said. H. N. WHEELER.

BOSTON, January 25, 1897.

[As Mr. Wheeler does not ask for lower rates on second-class matter than the Post-Office Department can afford to give, controversy with him is unnecessary. For reasons which need not be recapitulated, the Government has always discriminated in favor of the circulation of bona-fide newspapers and periodicals through the mails, to which policy we infer that Mr. Wheeler makes no objection. With this understanding, all that any reasonable person can ask is the establishment of an equilibrium between post-office receipts and expenditures by an increase of rates on that portion of the service which causes more outgo than income.—ED. NATION.]

THE ALFRED MEMORIAL.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In England signs are not lacking of a certain interest in a project for celebrating the thousandth anniversary of the death in 901 A. D. of King Alfred the Great. The hold which Alfred's memory has upon all the English-speaking peoples of the world, and the widely diffused realities of their characteristic life — laws, liberties, commerce on land and sea, the faculty of combination with the least sacrifice of individual initiative, their specific temperament in religion and in art — these are in some sense one and the same thing. That common something which lives in the life of all who use the English mother-tongue to-day is impersonated for all of us most happily and with surprising adequacy in the glorious figure of the ancient Wessex King; in the goodness and greatness, cavilled at by none, of Alfred—the first and ultimate "organizer" of our victories, and the promoter at their earliest outset of our enterprises. But a light radiating far beyond the confines—large though they be—of what we may call "Anglo-Saxondom" centres in Alfred's life. His noble enthusiasm for learning and piety gathered around him many who were not Anglo-Saxons. And his commemoration is one in which Irish-Americans—without whom American participation would be incomplete—may loyally join. Nor should either we or our brother Americans of German and Scandinavian stock forget that Alfred is one of those heroes whose memory associates us as of kindred origin. It is not easy to overestimate the degree in which King Alfred was stimulated in his work of enlightenment by what he saw as a youth when staying at the court of Charles the Great, and it is a manifest token of the real harmony of purpose underlying the successful endeavors of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all the early civilizers of Teutonic stock that Knut, the great Danish successor of Alfred, reënacted solemnly the laws established more than a century before by Alfred, who thus led captive a triumphant foe.

Those who feel that the common ties uniting the scattered sons of Alfred are stronger than the accidents of time and place that have sundered them, must certainly be appealed to by the general drift of Mr. Frederic Harrison's presidential address delivered three months ago at the October meeting of the Birmingham and Midland Institute on "The Millenary of Alfred the Great," though they may very possibly feel misgivings as to the particular form of monumental commemoration—a mausoleum to contain the remains of Alfred, now buried at Winchester, and to be a place like Westminster Abbey for the monumental commemoration of great men. Mr. Harrison's words were certainly well chosen when he said: "On the 26th of October, 1901, a thousand years will have passed by since the death of our greatest King. We are a little overdone with anniversaries; and those not always of the worthiest. But this is no ordinary occasion, for it will be the thousandth anniversary of him to whom England owes an incalculable debt of gratitude." By England is not here meant solely Great Britain and her empire, colonial and other, for we must include all the debtors of Alfred in our accounting; America has hardly a smaller score against her than the mother country where Alfred was King. Nor does Mr. Harrison think otherwise, for he goes on to say:

"Alfred's name is almost the only one in the long roll of our national worthies which awakens no bitter, no jealous thought—which combines the honor of all. Alfred represents at once the ancient monarchy, the army, the navy, the law, the literature, the art, the poetry, the enterprise, the industry, the religion of our race. . . . No difference of church arises to separate any who would join to do Alfred honor. No saint in the calendar was a more loyal and cherished member of the ancient faith; and yet no Protestant can imagine a purer and more simple follower of the Gospel. Alfred was a victorious warrior whose victories have left no curses behind them; a king whom no man ever charged with a harsh act; a scholar who never became a pedant; a saint who knew no superstition; a hero as bold as Launcelot, as spotless as Galahad."

It is not, I think, an accident, but one of the most significant features in the history of our race, which places only one other of our great men on anything like these pinnacles unvisited by the blame or scorn of men, and makes of Washington, the father of our country, the only figure in Anglo-Saxon history who may fitly be enshrined alongside of Alfred, the founder and father of that body, politic and social, from which our country sprang. Who has not felt the need of a type of heroic and national character so fashioned as to mediate between the blameless and generous, but still more or less definitely aristocratic Washington, and Lincoln, who was anything rather than of the aristocratic temperament? Whatever stress we may lay upon points in common shared by our two greatest men, I take it for granted that their divergent temperaments are recognized by all. Alfred's career and character give us something very like the missing link with which to bridge over the distance separating the two, and to frame a just appreciation of their diverse excellence. Indeed, the versatile genius of the great King of Wessex was developed by circumstances and surroundings which we may call American rather than English. By this I mean that Alfred's surroundings had much to remind us of the situation of the early colonists in Virginia and New England —not to speak of the more recent founders of the great West. His vein of "Yankee inventiveness" is well known, as is also his resourcefulness in the face of "irregular" military situations. In this last we can hardly fail to recognize a trait that has characterized the typical American management of the wars by which our national existence has been achieved and assured. There are, then, important aspects of King Alfred's career which Americans as such can understand and appreciate far more completely than Englishmen. Hence, perhaps, it is that no Plutarchian parallel could well be drawn between the two types of American greatness without some reference to the pioneering genius of King Alfred, who forms what we may call a living hyphen between the statelier moods of Washington and the homelier gifts and graces of Lincoln.

These considerations certainly suggest the appropriateness of some American manifestation of interest in the London meeting announced to be held in the course of next March at the Mansion House. Why should not the feelings of Americans in this matter, supposing them to be at all definite, find some sort of expression in time to make themselves known at this meeting? Anything of the kind would certainly be welcomed, since it would serve to make the proposed commemoration more truly an affair of the whole Anglo-Saxon race. The definite suggestion has already been made of a committee to include representatives of public services, universities, municipalities, learned societies, literature, art, and science, without any distinction of church, nationality, race, or party. A suitable representation of the United States would certainly be secured by American expressions of interest, and it has been intimated that persons who desire further information, and who wish to join the movement, are invited to communicate with any of the following: The Mayor, Guildhall, Winchester; the Dean, Deanery Winchester; the Headmaster, Winchester College.—Yours very truly,

LOUIS DYER.

OXFORD, January 18, 1898.

Notes.

Roberts Bros., Boston, will have the American market for the complete illustrated limited edition of Charles Lever's Novels, edited by his daughter, Mrs. Neville. It will be in thirty-seven octavo volumes, and be limited to sixty numbered sets. More than six hundred etchings and drawings from the original plates of "Phiz" and Cruikshank will be inserted, besides the wood engravings of Luke Fildes, M. E. Edwards, and others, and some new illustrations by Gordon Browne, a son of "Phiz." The manufacture will be Messrs. Constable's, and the printing from type.

Houghton, Mifflin & Co. will shortly have ready the tenth and concluding volume of the late Prof. Child's 'English and Scottish Popular Ballads,' under the supervision of Prof. Kittredge. They announce also the second series of Victor Hugo's Letters, and 'Birds of Village and Field,' by Miss Florence A. Merriam.

Nearly ready are 'H. R. H. the Prince of Wales' and a new and enlarged edition of Edmond Kelly's 'Evolution and Effort,' from the press of D. Appleton & Co.

Fresh announcements by the Macmillan Co. are 'Pasteur: his Life and Work,' by Percy Frankland and Mrs. Frankland; 'France,' by John Edward Courtenay Bodley, a work emulating Bryce's 'American Commonwealth'; 'Southern Soldier Stories,' by George Cary Eggleston; 'The Gospel of Freedom,' by Prof. Robert Herrick of the University of Chicago; 'Sources of Greek History,' by Anna Boynton Thayer; and an English translation, by Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, of Dr. Kronenberg's 'Kant: sein Leben und seine Lehre.'

Charles Scribner's Sons will soon publish 'A National Church,' by the Rev. William R. Huntington, D.D., and 'What is Good Music?' by W. J. Henderson.

M. F. Mansfield issues immediately 'The Story of the Potter,' by Charles F. Binns, of the Royal Worcester Porcelain Works.

A Burton Society is organizing in Denver "to promote the study of Oriental literature by publishing English translations of Oriental classics." It seeks a membership of one thousand, excluding "any person of immature years," in view of the first and perhaps only work to be undertaken, viz., a reprint of the Benares edition of Sir Richard F. Burton's translation of the 'Arabian Nights,' in sixteen volumes, "without omission or alteration." In short, this is a new form of publication by subscription. The society, whose temporary office is at No. 19 Barth Block, Denver, is provided with a President, Secretary, and—attorney.

T. Fisher Unwin, London, is reprinting from *Cosmopolis* the letters of Turgeneff, under the title, 'Turgeneff and his French Circle,' translated by a niece of Matthew Arnold. They range from 1850 to 1877, and are addressed to Flaubert, Daudet, Zola, George Sand, Taine, Renan, and Guy de Maupassant. Mr. Unwin will bring out in the spring 'Through Tibet Unknown,' by Capt. M. S. Welby and Lieut. Malcolm, with illustrations by Mr. McCormick. He has also in hand 'The Gladstone Colony: An Unwritten Chapter of Australian History,' by James Francis Hogan, M.P., and 'My Life in Two Hemispheres,' by Sir Charles Gavan Duffy.

In his preface to the eleventh volume of 'Book-Prices Current' (London: Elliot Stock), Mr. J. H. Slater shows how the exceptional prices fetched at the Ashburnham sale disturbed the lot average for the year (December, 1896—November, 1897). For the five previous years this average ranged from one pound six to one pound thirteen; last year it touched two pounds thirteen. Mr. Slater has given a real distinction to this volume by quoting all the Ashburnham cataloguer's bibliographical and descriptive notes, and has himself added not a few nor brief. The scheme of this useful record is unchanged. The arrangement is by sales; there is a table of subjects and an index of authors. There are 6,218 entries, or nearly 400 less than last year. The publisher still invites subscriptions at a guinea to a proposed general index to the first ten volumes.

Arthur C. Downer's 'Odes of Keats' (Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Henry Frowde) must be thought rather wooden treatment of so spontaneous a poet. The biographical and bibliographical apparatus is all very well, and makes the book con-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG.
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

venient for reference. The analyses are deadening, and the beginners for whom they seem intended should be warned against them. The way for such to approach Keats and his verse is through his Letters. From these (Letter to Reynolds, March 25, 1818) the editor might have borrowed the graphic sacrificial scene which foreshadows the action in the "Grecian Urn," and possesses a charm scarcely inferior. There are three portraits of Keats and two views of the Holland House urn.

A most welcome publication is that of 'A Legend of Camelot,' by the late George Du Maurier, not so much for the "legend" itself, an amusing burlesque of the Pre-Raphaelite manner in picture and verse, nor for "The Rise and Fall of the Jack Spratts" and other literary and artistic fragments which the Harpers have been gathering from the pages of *Punch*, as for the inimitable "Vers Nonsensiques," with their equally inimitable illustrations. It must be about twenty years since these rhymes and drawings were first published, and, while they have been lovingly remembered by a few, they will be entirely novel to the many. Du Maurier the society draughtsman has caused Du Maurier the caricaturist to be forgotten, and the delightful grotesqueness and good-natured fun of these sketches will come as a revelation even to many sincere admirers of their author. Of the verses it is hardly too much to say that they are the drollest, the wittiest, and the best of all the nonsense verse that has been written. Their audience must ever be fit though few, for a pretty thorough knowledge of two languages is as necessary for their comprehension as is a sense of humor; but to those who are capable of appreciating them they are a joy for ever. There are thirty-two of them, and from the "Beau Gendarme" at the beginning to the "Portrait de l'Auteur," who sings tralala and loves his mamma, at the end, there is not one that does not contain some astonishing bi-lingual perversion, some *tour de force* of alliteration, some shrewd thrust at national characteristics, some extravagant jingle or topsy-turvy piece of fantastic foolery.

It is difficult to find a reason for the republication in book form of 'Cartoons by Homer C. Davenport' (De Witt Publishing House). Some of the portraits show a kind of power in the retaining of a likeness in spite of the wildest exaggeration, and doubtless the political cartoons more properly so called served their purpose when published; but the effect of the whole collection gathered together between covers is intensely painful. We have never seen the work of a caricaturist in which ugliness was so overpowering and fun so absent. Many of our would-be comic draughtsmen are apt to mistake mere hideousness for humor, but Mr. Davenport has gone further than any of them on that road, and, if his work is popular, it speaks ill for the public taste. True caricature is an enjoyable art, but it is hardly conceivable what kind of being could enjoy these caricatures of caricature.

Dr. Justin Herold's 'Manual of Legal Medicine' (Lippincott) has unfortunately "been written during brief intervals of leisure." Nevertheless it is a fair working volume, covering toxicological and forensic medicine sufficiently to give the general practitioner reasonable guidance as to his duty in emergencies where the law may ultimately be invoked, until the case falls into the hands of an expert. The most interesting, and potentially the most immediately important, chapter is that discussing electricity in connection with the death penalty. While there is no distinct assertion, doubt is left with the reader as to the actual cause of death following the judicial use of electricity.

'The Origin of Disease,' by Dr. Arthur V. Meigs (Lippincott), is a purely medical work of the higher grade which would better be named '*An* Origin of Disease,' for those affections afflicting man which have an acknowledged external cause are expressly excluded. After much contact with the sick, the author recognized the unsatisfactoriness of the precise classification of diseases in the text-books, and the failure of the teaching faculty to appreciate certain general causes that he believes bind together apparently dissimilar pathological states. He intimates that, even in scientific medicine, as certainly in the popular view, the group of symptoms known as a disease is regarded too nearly as an entity; and he offers here at least one generalization pointing to a kinship among the disabilities of different organs and among diseases that are nominally distinct. This generalization is that fibrosis, which is the growth and increase of fibroid material, and is the essential change incident to age and leads to its necessary consequence, death, is also concerned in earlier years in bringing about a long chain of troubles, variously named, but all tending to premature and fatal decay. The large octavo is copiously and excellently illustrated on steel directly from the author's own specimens. Dr. Meigs would be untrue to his profession did he not add chapters on diagnosis and treatment; and while his colleagues may not accept all his conclusions, they certainly will find many valuable and stimulating suggestions in this thoughtful work.

A valuable contribution to a subject of psychological interest and practical importance is August Löwenstein's 'Aberglaube und Strafrecht' (Berlin: Röde), in which he traces the influence of popular superstition in promoting crime. Germany is especially rich in material of this sort, partly the survivals of paganism and partly the results of Christian teachings concerning demonolatry and witchcraft; and it will be impossible to eradicate this evil so long as the Catholic Church prescribes formulas and performs rites for the exorcism and expulsion of devils. The introduction to the volume is by Prof. Joseph Kohler of Berlin.

'Michael v. Munkacsy: Erinnerungen—Die Kindheit' (Berlin: Fontane) is the first volume of the distinguished artist's autobiography, in which he describes his childhood. He was by no means one of those precocious infants who begin in the nursery to reveal the talents that make the man illustrious, unless perhaps the distinct recollection of his admiration for the colors on his father's Turkish tobacco-pipe may be accepted as a presage of the painter's career. His earliest bent seems to have been in the direction of "bold emprise"; for one day, when he overturned the inkstand and left its contents on the writing-desk, he ran off into a neighboring forest to join a band of robbers. He was left an orphan at a tender age and came to his uncle, who afterwards apprenticed him to a joiner. This life, as he imagined it, "running through the streets barefoot, with sleeves rolled up and an apron on," struck the boy as most fascinating, but the illusion was soon dispelled by the reality under a rude master. After his apprenticeship was finished, a German painter named Fischer discovered his genius and gave him the first instruction. How the mechanic developed into the masterly painter will be related in a second and concluding volume. The work is written in a simple style that lends additional charm to the narration.

The fourth volume of the 'Bismarck-Jahrbuch,' edited by Dr. Horst Kohl, and just published by Goeschen in Leipzig, is an octavo of 421 pages, and consists of three parts, of which the first contains various documents and letters never before printed. The correspondence between William I. and Bismarck, between Bismarck and Roon and other persons, covers the period from 1864 to 1887, and comprises more than a hundred letters. The second part is composed of speeches, dissertations, and poems, and the third part is a chronicle of events, consisting of telegrams, letters, and newspaper articles, and extending from September 17, 1896, to December 31, 1896. There is no doubt about the value of the material here collected as a source of information for the future historian. The editor, however, laments in his preface the purely "platonic affection" of the German public for his work, and declares that unless there is a great increase in the number of subscribers and purchasers, it will be impossible to continue the publication.

A German 'Poole's Index' makes its appearance with 'Bibliographie der Deutschen Zeitschriften-Litteratur,' Vol. I., being an alphabetical topical index of 8,500 contributions to about 275 (mostly scientific) German periodicals for the year 1896, with author's name, number of pages, and price of volume (or number if to be had separately). Medicine and Technology are excluded. The publishers are F. Andrä's Nachfolger, Leipzig (New York: Lemcke & Buechner), and the price $2.50.

The most notable feature of the *American Historical Review* for January is the Notes of Major William Pierce on the Federal Convention of 1787, to which body he was a delegate from Georgia. These Notes are printed from the lately discovered manuscript, but three-quarters of them have appeared in print, though so long ago and in such a way as to make them now all but inaccessible to students. They do not add much to the familiar reports, and they are wholly occupied with discussions on the form of government. Slavery is not mentioned in them, and there is only a slant at it in a prefatory letter to St. George Tucker, when, apologizing for the absence of a bill of rights, Pierce says: "I believe it would have been difficult in the extreme to have brought the different States to agree in what probably would have been proposed as the very first principle, and that is, 'that all men are born equally free and independent.' Would a Virginian have accepted it in this form?" This shows how far the Declaration of Independence had already been left behind; or, rather, how far it was still in advance—as it is to-day. But much the most interesting and valuable portion of the Notes is the concluding fourth division—"Characters in the Convention," a personal description of each delegate. Here the most striking revelation is the comparative youthfulness of the body, and the large number of men under forty. Pierce exhibits no sectional antipathy whatever, and gives the impression of a fair-minded man.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Field Columbian Museum Publication No. 24 (Chicago) contains the annual report of the Director, who gives an account, with illustrations, of the arrangement of the natural-history collections of the institution and the manner in which they are preserved and exhibited.

A report on 'The Fossils of the Galena-Trenton and Black River Formations of Lake Winnipeg and its Vicinity' in the Museum of the Geological Survey of Canada constitutes part three of the third volume of "Palæozoic Fossils" now in course of publication. The text is by J. F. Whiteaves, and includes descriptions of several new species. The drawings for the illustrations were made from nature by L. M. Lambe.

"The Causes of the Ice Age" is the subject of a paper by Warren Upham of St. Paul, Minnesota, published in the twenty-ninth volume of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute of London. The writer asserts that it is practically demonstrated that the ice age ended not longer than 6,000 or 10,000 years ago. In the discussion of the paper by the Institute, there was read a letter from Sir Joseph Prestwich—interesting as being the last communication received from that eminent geologist—in which he endorsed the views of Mr. Upham as to the end of the ice age, but not as to its cause. The volume also contains a paper, by Mr. T. G. Pinches, on Babylonian inscriptions, and one by Sir J. W. Dawson on an extinct people of the Canaries.

The Royal Academy of Sciences of Bologna has begun the publication of a new series of 'Rendiconti.' The first volume consists of four numbers, and contains an account of the proceedings of the Academy from November, 1896, to June, 1897.

The Zurich Observatory has been enabled, by the bequest of its late director, Prof. Rudolf Wolf, to begin a new series of publications. The first volume contains an account of Prof. A. Wolfer's observations of the surface of the sun during 1887-'89. The observations for the five following years will appear in 1898.

—"The Danger from Experimental Psychology" is a title not likely to attract every reader, but the article in the February *Atlantic* which bears it will be found of more than common interest by all who care about questions connected with the theory of education. Many a well-informed man may not know that the "new" psychology is now taught in "laboratories," the apparatus in which consists of chronoscopes, and chronographs, and kymographs, and sphygmographs, and pneumographs, and myographs, and ergographs. Of these laboratories Harvard possesses one, and Mr. Münsterberg is the director of it; yet out of his psychical pulpit he lifts up a voice of warning, and declares that he feels impelled to say that he has "never measured a psychical fact," and never expects to do such a thing. The new psychologist, it seems, brings his system under the headings, not merely of memory, attention, feeling, emotion, perception, and volition, but of space, time, and energy, and on this new basis he proposes to build up a new system of pedagogics. Mr. Münsterberg has no objection to his measuring as much as he pleases, and is quite ready to measure with him, but warns him against supposing that he is measuring the states of the soul or mind. The headquarters of the pestilent fallacy which is exposed would seem to be Yale, which has produced a book, written by some one who brings in a report of experimental psychology under the titles Space, Time, and Energy, for all the world as he might have brought it in "under the titles Iron, Wood, and Hard Rubber after the different physical instruments we need for the study of psychical facts," "pretending that, therefore, the mental facts themselves are of hard rubber, wood, or iron." The conclusion of the whole matter is, that the laboratory work of the new school is of no use whatever to teachers as such. Mr. T. W. Higginson, in his reminiscences "On the Outskirts of Public Life," brings up the old question whether literary is compatible with oratorical success in the same career. He quotes Wendell Phillips as having decided the question for himself in the negative, but thinks he was wrong. That is, he thinks that Phillips might have been as good a writer as he was an orator, had he so applied himself. But Mr. Higginson's own analysis of the conditions of oratorical as compared with literary success is rather at war with this reminiscential fancy. Mr. Russell Sturgis has a readable article on Architecture. He thinks, among other things, that if architects knew more about building, they would be better architects. We have heard many householders express the same opinion.

—*Scribner's* opens with an illustrated article by Mr. Avery D. Andrews, on the "Police Control of a Great Election"—*i. e.*, the election of the present Mayor of New York. Mr. Andrews, having been Police Commissioner under Mayor Strong, is thoroughly familiar with the subject, and imparts a good deal of curious information. One fact which should not be overlooked is, that it is only in the last three years that the thousands of election officers (in 1897 there were 12,196) have had to pass any proper examination as to fitness. The introduction of this reform in 1895 so disgusted many candidates that one out of every ten declined to qualify, while a still larger proportion either failed to pass or were removed for cause. Capt. Mahan has a valuable illustrated article on the naval campaign of 1776 on Lake Champlain, to the delay caused by which he attributes the capture of Burgoyne and his army at Saratoga in 1777. The precise difference between Benedict Arnold's galleys and gondolas the author says he has been unable to ascertain, but he thinks that the former were probably keeled. Helen Watterson Moody, in her fourth paper on "The Unquiet Sex," considers the "case of Maria," who, it seems, was discharged from domestic service for insisting on playing the banjo. We must protest against the treatment of this as presenting a "problem." Maria had to be discharged, though she was a good servant, because the principle of equality, or, as it is sometimes called, justice, must be applied in the kitchen as in the drawing-room. If Maria the maid plays the banjo, it is impossible to deny Bridget the cook the right to play the violin, Mary the laundress the tambourine, and Sam the "useful man" the bones. But the noise and discomfort produced by this equality of opportunity would obviously impair the domestic peace of the rest of the household, and, therefore, as we say, Maria really has no case at all. Family magazines like *Scribner's* ought not to promote domestic disorder in this way. It is only fair to add, however, that Maria is brought in to serve as an illustration for an argument in which she is irrelevant. The drift of the argument itself is to show that servants, in order to lead full and free lives, ought to go out of the house and be masters of their own time as soon as their work is done. There is nothing that we know of in the way of such an arrangement in either laws or Constitution, provided an agreement is made to that effect; but in actual life there are many difficulties in the way which do not appear to have been fully considered by the writer.

—In *Harper's* "An Incident," by Sarah Barnwell Elliott, is sure to be read by everybody, for it is an inherently interesting and well-told story. Students of "realism" will notice that it has none of the usual machinery; the locality is vague, and there are no bright red sounds, nor low murmuring neutral colors, nor violent blackguardism to make us say how true, how exactly like life! What makes the story real is what, as Shakspere noticed, makes a play real—the behavior and speech of the characters, and the self-effacement of the story-teller. Her only intrusion is in the last four lines—lines which, to our mind, impair a climax already perfect in its simplicity. A most entertaining bit of critical writing is Du Maurier's lecture, now published for the first time, on "Social Pictorial Satire." It is the first of a series, and deals with Leech, being illustrated by some of his best caricatures. Du Maurier (who was Leech's successor) ingeniously contrives to give, not merely his view of Leech, but a sketch (through the medium of a contrast between English society and life as drawn by himself and his predecessor) of the social changes which have come over England in the last fifty years. He makes Leech the caricaturist of the world of which Thackeray was the satirist, and which has been almost suddenly superseded under our eyes by a world new in aims and theories, and fashions, and morality, and society, and belles and beaux, and even snobs. Times change, and we and the comic papers with them, but it is seldom that the slides for the show are prepared for our entertainment successively by two such masters of the craft. The Hon. David Turpie furnishes the inevitable article on the "Isthmian Canal," for which we sincerely trust that readers may be found. "Some Americans from Oversea," by Kirk Munroe (illustated), ought to encourage those who are trembling for fear lest America should be spoiled by immigration.

—The success of the "Workers" brought out by one magazine will not let editors of the others sleep; hence, perhaps, we have in the *Century* the adventures of H. Phelps Whitmarsh as a gentleman steerage-passenger. His "Steerage of To-day," illustrated by some clever pictures by A. Castaigne, belongs to the same family with the "Workers," and derives, as the lawyers say, directly from our old friend the "Casual" of a quarter of a century since. We doubt very much whether the multiplication of such studies will add to their interest, partly because few writers have the art to make us believe in the reality of the tale; and this we say without the slightest desire to impugn the veracity of any one. We have no doubt that Mr. H. Phelps Whitmarsh has really crossed in the steerage, but it is only too evident that it was a case of a good man gone wrong. We resent the idea of any one who so clearly belongs in the first cabin un-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dertaking to interpret the steerage to us, on the strength of a masquerade trial of it for six or seven days. In nine cases out of ten what will impress him, and consequently his readers, is the very disagreeable nature of the trip undertaken under such circumstances; while, to the ordinary steerage passenger, the voyage is very often a rather enjoyable holiday in a life of toil. Mr. Jacob A. Riis's "Heroes Who Fight Fire," with pictures by Jay Hambidge, is a very interesting account of wonderful feats in saving life performed by firemen in the ordinary course of duty. No one who has seen even an ordinary rescue with scaling ladders will doubt the stories told; they come from eye-witnesses. What is most remarkable about it, perhaps, is the fact that these feats should have become so much a part of the routine of a fireman's life that they attract no attention, and are taken as a matter of course—and this in a city in which two generations ago firemen were "toughs," who fought each other at fires, and were sometimes suspected of setting them. Tweed, if we remember right, was a graduate of the old fire service. Mr. Riis notices that one trait of the most daring and heroic life-savers is their modesty. They do not boast or bluster or rant about exploits which require the nerve, strength, and skill of an acrobat and the contempt for death of a martyr.

— The second volume of the second series of the great 'Index-Catalogue of the Library of the Surgeon-General's Office, U. S. A.' contains the letter B. As was observable in its predecessor, there has been no relaxation in procuring the earliest medical works. Johannes Bavarius's 'Consilia' (1489) is at the head of these, so far as we have detected. There is a noticeable cluster of ancients under Bloodletting, though one and a half pages of periodical references show that neither the practice nor the discussion is extinct. Among the fuller sections are Bacillus and Bacteria (35 pages), and Bibliography (11 pages). Bible medicine has a page, Beer one and a half pages. Bicycles, a rubric unknown to Volume 2 of the first series (1881), now exacts a page. New, also, is Baseball (with its baseball-pitcher's arm), and no doubt Football is lying in wait for the cataloguer to assert its rights. Beri-beri would appear to be on the increase, or attracting more attention, since 1880, when a page was enough for it in Volume 1 of the first series; now four are needed for this disease. Hardly any title surprises us in the present collection, where Baby-jumpers, Baking-powders, Bread, Bees and Wasps, and Botacudos (of Brazil) jostle each other. Even "Betrayed by his Thumb," a newspaper clipping, is given its line or two. Sir Thomas Browne's 'Religio Medici' (1682) is not out of place; nor S. Smith's 'Lecture delivered over the remains of Jeremy Bentham' (1832); nor John Bartram's 'Observations' of travel in this country, beside his 'Descriptions' of certain American plants for their medicinal uses. Less to be expected is Ely Bates's 'Rural Philosophy'; or Reflections on knowledge, virtue, and happiness, chiefly in reference to a life of retirement in the country' (1807). Retirement is the word for Alexander Graham Bell's pamphlet 'Upon the electrical experiments to determine the location of the bullet in the body of the late President Garfield,' in view of the searching applications of the X-rays. History and philology and criminology go hand in hand in the case of Burking, with its eight entries (1828-1831). It should be noted that in many if not the majority of cases the publisher's name, as well as the place of publication, is affixed to book-titles—a concession not common in catalogues.

—'Celebrated Trials,' by Henry Lauren Clinton (Harpers), contains much matter that was, some that still is, of thrilling interest, but smothered with an intolerable deal of padding. In many of these cases Mr. Clinton simply gives his own addresses to the jury, from which, of course, no one would think of drawing an inference as to the facts or the merits. Thus, of the case of the People against Richard Croker, for murder, the public would probably just now like to know something, but Mr. Clinton merely gives his own summing up. He assured the jury that his effort was entirely a work of supererogation; that all the evidence was conclusive on the side of the defence. But as the jury were out twenty-four hours without being able to agree, nearly half of them holding out for conviction, the reader naturally suspects that there may have been more in the case than Mr. Clinton admits. Half the book is given up to the Burdell murder case, of which a moderately condensed account would still arouse interest, but the pages of tedious and diffuse stuff that Mr. Clinton prints are largely unreadable. More tolerable is the account of some of the legal proceedings following the downfall of Tweed; but as the criterion of celebrity in this book is Mr. Clinton's participation in a case, we get rather one-sided views. He informs us that during the first twenty years of his practice he defended about a hundred murder cases and succeeded in them all; but if he would arouse the interest of the public, he should tell it how many of these defendants really deserved to be hanged.

THE BATTLE OF FRANKLIN.

The Battle of Franklin, Tennessee, November 30, 1864. A Monograph. By Jacob D. Cox, late Major-General Commanding Twenty-third Army Corps. With maps. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1897.

The dramatic quality of Sherman's great progress through Georgia, opposed but not interrupted by Wheeler's ill-disciplined troopers and by occasional armed but inefficient forces, has left upon the popular imagination the impression that it was the natural reward of the serious campaign that culminated at Atlanta. Hood had been defeated, the strategic objective had been occupied, there was no great army to oppose the Union columns that might at will move upon Selma or Mobile, upon Charleston or Savannah, reasonably free from anxiety until the new goal should come in view. In fact, the March to the Sea was in the nature of a military picnic until the defences of Savannah were reached, and Hazen's assault of Fort McAllister on the lower Ogeechee was practically the only fighting required to establish a base on salt water. It was all the fruit of the strategy and the hard knocks that pushed first Johnston and then Hood out of the way. But the intelligent soldier and the historical student know that that was not the whole story. The equation was one of two unknown quantities. Sherman disposed of one, but the very troublesome other one he left behind him. Thomas and Nashville, with many anxious warring preliminary days under sombre skies, were as necessary to the solution as were the confident and well-organized columns that swung out gayly on their famous tramp.

Hood had been outgeneralled and outfought, but his army was not destroyed. Atlanta had been evacuated, not surrendered, and the aggressive Confederate had led thirty thousand men against Sherman's line of supply. When he had been driven off, he moved, with the consent of President Davis and under the supervision of Gen. Beauregard, into northern Alabama, and announced with some bravado that Sherman's departure into the interior was to the military advantage of the South. In one sense it might be. At least it divided the Union forces and left Hood free to attempt, what the Confederate President asserted would be done, to carry the war again toward Kentucky. To capture Nashville, and to approach if not pass the Ohio, was the ambitious but not impossible task he had set himself. Joined by Forrest with more than ten thousand cavalry (or, properly, mounted infantry), he had forty-two or forty-three thousand men present for duty. This was a command that some one must put out of action beyond any recuperation, and the march to the sea must be justified on the watersheds of the Tennessee and the Cumberland.

Hood's delay at Tuscumbia and Florence until late in November enabled Gen. Thomas, from his headquarters at Nashville, to concentrate at Pulaski, seventy-five miles south, a considerable force under Gen. Schofield. His general instructions were to retard the rebel advance as much as possible, without running too great risk of sacrificing his smaller army as it retired on Nashville. Strictly complying with those injunctions, which were reiterated at every point of contact, Schofield carried out a vigorous defensive in his retrogression, and by a brilliant march, which our limits forbid discussing, moved his command into Franklin on the south bank of the Harpeth, twenty miles from Nashville, in the morning of November 30, 1864.

The troops immediately under Schofield were two divisions of his own corps (Twenty-third), three divisions of the Fourth Corps under Major-Gen. Stanley, and Wilson's cavalry division. But the cavalry had lost touch since the previous morning. There had been a sharp engagement at Spring Hill, twelve miles south, and it was imperative to break the immediate contact of the enemy and to hold the crossing of the Harpeth for the passage of trains. It was hoped that the fight, if Hood forced it, would be with the river in front; but there must be a strong defence south of the river, to gain time for the passage of the impedimenta. Brigadier-Gen. Cox, commanding the leading division (Third Division, Twenty-third Corps), accompanied by Gen. Schofield, reached the outskirts of Franklin about two hours before daylight, and halted his troops on both sides of the main road. After personal observation of the defective bridges and imperfect ford, Schofield determined to give his personal attention to their repair, and gave Cox temporary command of both divisions of the Twenty-third Corps and ordered him to hold the enemy at all hazards. The Twenty-third Corps artillery was sent to the north bank, with the promise (which was redeemed) of replacing it by the Fourth Corps batteries as they came up. A fair natural line of defence was selected, and, with the skill

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and energy developed by the perpetual fighting of the previous six months, a rough but effective infantry parapet, without revetment but with a ditch on both sides the greater part of its length, was promptly thrown up. Stations for the guns were prepared, and as the turnpike must be left unobstructed for the incoming trains and troops, a short second line crossed it about seventy yards to the rear. Later, this retrenchment was prolonged somewhat to the right by voluntary labor. In rear of much, but not all, of the main line was a reserve. Wood's division of the Fourth Corps passed the river, and was posted with the Twenty-third Corps artillery to protect the final crossing, or to move by either flank should the enemy make his way to that bank above or below the town. Kimball's division of the Fourth Corps had already been ordered to report to Gen. Cox for position on the line, and had been placed in echelon to the right and rear of the right division of the Twenty-third Corps (Ruger's), thus interruptedly connecting the right flank with the river just at the edge of the town. Two brigades of Wagner's division of the Fourth Corps were detained by Gen. Schofield's order about half a mile outside the line to delay Hood, but Opdycke's brigade of the same division came within the works as a reserve and as such did splendid service. It was contemplated that the remaining brigades should also form a reserve within the lines when their temporary duty was completed.

The hastily constructed defences, reasonably strong in some parts, necessarily weak in others, proved the salvation of the defenders. They were the military precautions a soldier would take, in this instance had taken admirably; but it could not be anticipated that Hood would actually assault when he found the lines were manned. As long as his forces crowded upon the immediate trail of the wagons, he would naturally seek their capture. But the superb rear-guard work of Wagner's division had brought in all the transportation and all the stragglers, and not only had the trains entered the defences, but nearly all of them had crossed the river before Hood's columns came within striking distance. With his overwhelming cavalry, and with fords available above and below the town, Hood might cross the river at will, and again, as at Pulaski, at Columbia, at Spring Hill itself, get upon the flank of the retiring army. But he assaulted. The fighting was terrific, the slaughter frightful, and the result to the Union was a victory whose full fruit was gathered a fortnight later at Nashville, when Sherman's audacity was vindicated by the moral courage and the splendid generalship of Thomas, before which the Confederate army of the Tennessee melted away.

While the responsibility for a lost battle is frequently the subject of controversy and crimination among many and for years, the pæans of victory are rarely marred by the discord of complaint. But Franklin is an exception. First, it has been charged repeatedly that Schofield's conduct of the campaign was bad, that more than once he barely escaped defeat because of too persistent lingering in the presence of a superior foe, that he neither planned the defence nor commanded on the field at Franklin, and that the battle fought itself so far as he was concerned. Secondly, it has been claimed for Gen. Wagner that his rash challenge of the whole Confederate army was devoted heroism in compliance with direct orders, and that whatever happened in connection with his division followed distinct obedience to and not disregard of the commands he had received. And, thirdly, a bitter discussion has arisen in regard to Gen. Stanley's share in the engagement, and, depending thereon, as to Gen. Cox's authority at the time and the credit due him.

To take the second point first: Gen. Wagner, whose division had been an admirable rear-guard, held with two of his brigades a position a half or a third of a mile south of the main body, under orders to keep certain heights "until dark, unless too severely pressed." By any ordinary interpretation this would mean that, if too severely pressed, he was to fall back in an orderly manner upon the main body. It is perfectly conceivable that, by making the old rear-guard an outpost, Gen. Schofield intended to give the rebel line something to play against, while he used it as eyes for his defensive front (in addition to Wilson, who was again in touch on the flanks) to observe whether Hood, encamped in line of battle, would cross the river above, or, most unlikely, would assault directly. When he saw that the enemy would certainly advance in great force, it was Wagner's duty to withdraw, for the pressure upon which his retiring was contingent could as well be moral as physical. Moreover, he had been reminded by his superiors and was warned by his subordinates to fall back. But the fury of fight replaced his judgment, and he attempted to hold his two brigades behind the slenderest extemporized shelter, against numbers so overwhelming that they disdained to halt and return his fire, but swept away the outpost by their sheer momentum and poured around both sides of the arrow-head it had formed. Wagner's brigades retired when too late, in confusion, with the enemy swarming among their ranks, and the heterogeneous crowd rushed pell-mell over the centre, whose fire was masked by the retreating Unionists. The enemy effected a lodgment within the lines, while the troops, displaced by the shock of the onset, scattered to the rear. The right and left stood firm. Opdycke was equal to the occasion; and, after an heroic conflict, the enemy was finally driven back over the parapet, to whose outer slope then he clung, where successive reinforcing waves broke in vain. It was the narrowest of rescues, a hairbreadth escape.

Wagner's obstinacy imperilled Schofield's army, whose defeat would seriously have compromised the campaign. Hood's success, even in part, would by that much have meant Sherman's discomfiture. Wagner's fault was not only a lack of judgment, but a violation of instructions equivalent to a disobedience of orders. Nor can there be any doubt that the retrograde movement into which his men were forced became a rout. Yet such is the leniency which victory inspires that grave errors may be glossed over, and Gen. Cox, in a preliminary report, dated two days later (December 2), says that Wagner's two brigades, "in accordance with orders, fell leisurely back within our lines" (p. 218 Off. Rec. xlv., pt. 1, p. 349). This friendly acceptance of Gen. Wagner's own version is contradicted by an entry in Gen. Cox's journal, under date of December 1, " . . . . in Wagner's division, which was driven in from the front, in confusion . . . ," and in his more formal report six weeks later, where he says of the two brigades that "before an order [to retire] could reach them, they were so hotly engaged that they could not be withdrawn in order," and, "after a short and brave though useless struggle, [they] broke to the rear in confusion."

Of Schofield's generalship at Franklin we shall say no more than that after crossing the river in the manner and for the purpose already described, he established his own headquarters on an eminence overlooking the entire field, whence he controlled the troops on both sides of the stream. There can be no doubt that Schofield carefully confirmed and accepted every defensive arrangement that Cox as his lieutenant had made, just as he sent to him portions of the other corps, and that through his staff he was in direct communication with his entire army. It has never been doubted that Hood actually commanded the Confederates, although for a good part of the engagement the combatant lines were out of his sight. Schofield commanded with his divisions before his eyes, and, when the enemy had been repulsed, he withdrew his forces according to a carefully prearranged plan. There can be no question that, as the culmination of an important movement, Franklin was Schofield's battle, nor that his commission as a brigadier-general in the regular army was appropriate reward for the high service he rendered there and previously.

Thirdly: What were the respective functions of Generals Cox and Stanley at Franklin? Gen. Cox was a brigadier-general and division commander, to whom, very early in the morning, Gen. Schofield transferred temporarily the immediate command of his own corps (Twenty-third), and intrusted the erection of certain field-works, with which and with the forces under him to hold back Hood at all hazards until the trains were safely out of the way. There is nothing to show that at the beginning it was contemplated that he should have more infantry than the Twenty-third Corps. Gen. Stanley, who reached the field later in the morning, was a major-general in permanent command of a corps (Fourth). Both corps commanders were under the immediate command of a superior, Gen. Schofield, who was present. The two divisions of the Twenty-third Corps had been in advance and the three divisions of the Fourth Corps followed and covered the rear, while the consolidated trains of both corps were escorted between them. Ruger's division (Twenty-third Corps) arrived about seven A. M., and was placed on the right of Cox's own; but, as it could not extend the defensive line to the river, Gen. Cox called Gen. Schofield's attention to the deficiency, and the latter ordered Kimball's division (Fourth Corps) to report to Cox "for position." Kimball was placed by Cox on the extreme right to fill the gap. By three o'clock nearly all of the transportation was out of Franklin. As they arrived, the Fourth Corps batteries reported by Gen. Schofield's order to Gen. Cox, and were assigned by him to firing positions. Two brigades of Gen. Wagner's division (Fourth Corps) remained (by Gen. Schofield's order, conveyed through Gen. Stanley) without the lines for a temporary purpose, and Opdycke's brigade of the same division was in reserve within the works behind the centre. Gen. Schofield notified Gen. Cox that when Wagner's other brigades came in they also were to act as "a general reserve." Gen. Stanley

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was at Gen. Schofield's headquarters within the lines in the morning; but, except at 11:30 A. M., by Gen. Schofield's direction to Wagner yet without the line, he does not appear to have issued any order, nor was there occasion. About two o'clock in the afternoon Gen. Stanley accompanied Gen. Schofield to the north bank, and, while there, gave commands for the movement and the escort of the Fourth Corps trains. When warned by the unexpected severity of the firing that Hood was making a serious attack, he rode rapidly to the front, reached Opdycke just as he was charging, and a few minutes later was severely wounded. The wrangle is over two points: Was Cox in sole immediate command along the whole defensive line; and, if not, what was Stanley's rôle?

In a volume on the same subject ('The March to the Sea, Franklin and Nashville'), published in 1882, Gen. Cox, narrating events before action was joined, several times referred to himself at a certain stage of the defence as "the commandant on the line" (pp. 85-87). To this Gen. Stanley took urgent public exception. Nevertheless it appears to be strictly appropriate as a paraphrase of the historian to avoid directly naming himself. As soon as Stanley is present, Cox refers to them both as "the commandants of the two corps." An article in the *Century* war papers by Col. Stone, asserting that all the troops in the works were ordered to report to Gen. Cox, assigned to command the defences, was the occasion of a further protest by Gen. Stanley, who made a positive claim for the active command of the Fourth Corps present, on the ground that, had such troops been detached, it would have removed him from the command of his corps. That is untenable. It is within the province of a superior to detach companies, regiments, brigades, what he will, from one organized command, and attach them to another for a special purpose and during a certain period. The real question is, were the parts of the Fourth Corps behind the defences of Franklin under Gen. Cox's orders, and did Gen. Stanley's presence change their status in that respect? Or, to put it in another way, what position, if any, did Stanley fill as a general during the battle?

Both Cox and Stanley have changed the expression of their views within the thirty-three years that have elapsed since they scorned the hostile bullets together. In two reports of this battle, made December 2 and January 10, Gen. Cox states that Gen. Stanley assumed command of the troops of the Fourth Corps at a certain time, after which he disclaims authority over them, Opdycke's brigade excepted. Again, in 1881, when Gen. Cox was preparing his earlier book on Franklin, he had an amicable correspondence with Gen. Stanley, who assented to certain premises as exactly correct. These included a statement that Opdycke was Cox's reserve, that Wagner was to come in for the same purpose, and that Opdycke and the artillery acted under Gen. Cox's orders until midnight, but that orders to the rest of Wagner's division and to Kimball went from Stanley's headquarters. But in the present volume it is Gen. Cox's contention that all the troops within the defensive line were under his command, and his alone, that his authority was recognized at the time by all the officers ordered to report to him in the presence of Hood's formidable array, and that Stanley's presence, whether for a shorter or longer period, did not affect this relation. He explains the discrepancy between this position and that taken previously by stating that, sympathizing with an officer wounded doing a gallant act, but in no official position, he understated his own authority, and attributed to the other a command which he did not exercise (p. 300). Gen. Stanley's views also underwent a change. In his report of February 25 he speaks of going towards Cox's position as though it were an independent one, after the line had been restored, and he refers to Gen. Cox as his neighbor who had gallantly helped him. In other words, he assumes as a matter of course his active and important command over the parts of the Fourth Corps present, and only casually refers to the Twenty-third Corps and its position. But in 1881 he acknowledged that Opdycke, who made the fiercest fighting, and the batteries were under Cox, which is relinquishing the underlying principle of his original report; and subsequently he reverted to his original view and denied that Cox commanded more than the Twenty-third Corps troops.

The facts are these: The Fourth Corps batteries had been substituted for those of the Twenty-third Corps, and thus became integral parts of its divisions, from which they could be relieved only by the army commander. Kimball's division (Fourth Corps) had reported by Gen. Schofield's order to Gen. Cox "for position on the line." The phraseology is the same as that used for the batteries and for Ruger's division of the Twenty-third Corps. Although Gen. Cox, in his official report, disclaimed the authority, nevertheless, while the fighting was heavy, he actually exercised it by calling for a regiment from Kimball to reinforce Ruger, which was sent without demur. Gen. Cox, not Gen. Stanley, was notified that Wagner's division would be assigned as a general reserve, and Opdycke's brigade was so placed. Opdycke in like manner responded to Cox's call of warning when the danger became imminent, but went into action before Cox's order to attack reached him and without an order from Stanley. To Wagner's disorganized brigades Cox issued no order except a request that they would not block the bridges against teams, which was complied with. But, while they were yet in advance, he warned Wagner with authority not to tarry too long without the line. He specially commended Opdycke because of his services while he, Cox, had commanded the line. His facts are therefore at variance with his original theory. He was a *de facto* commander without doubt, although he appeared at the time to recognize that Stanley had a *de jure* control over the parts of his own corps, notwithstanding that, as already shown, of his own motion he transferred a regiment from a Fourth to a Twenty-third Corps division after Stanley reached the field.

If Gen. Stanley's contention is correct, that Kimball's relation to Cox ceased when once placed upon the line, as it would have been had he reported to an engineer charged with the arrangement of troops for defence, then necessarily he remained under Gen. Stanley's orders. He must have been under some one, for no division would lie contiguous to a corps without superior direction when two corps and an army commander were accessible. But there can be no reasonable doubt that Gen. Schofield meant Gen. Cox to have the immediate command of the defences he had laid out, and that he did have such command, nor that everything within that line properly belonged to him. The selection may not have been, and probably was not, made deliberately as against Gen. Stanley, but it was made. Cox was put in immediate command because he was there, and he, not any one else, was ordered to hold the line at all hazards. When the later assignment was made, there were the confusion and pressure incident to a running fight in temporary abeyance. Chalmers's cavalry was already in sight on the right, and Schofield, harassed to make safe the crossing, ordered Kimball to Cox "for position." Had he intended him to be independent of Cox he would have ordered Stanley to assign him to a place, or would have specified it himself. Under the order, Cox might have placed Kimball anywhere and have moved into the gap brigades already placed. So Wagner was ordered to form a general reserve when he came within the line, and Cox was notified to that effect. A general reserve could only mean one assignable at the will of the commander of the defences. There can be no question that the Fourth Corps batteries were incorporated within the Twenty-third Corps so intimately that they could not be displaced by Gen. Stanley, any more than Gen. Cox could have recalled the Twenty-third Corps guns for which they had been exchanged.

It might, nevertheless, be contended that Kimball and Wagner remained administrative units under the commanding officer of the Fourth Corps, subject to the limitations of specific positions designated by the Twenty-third Corps commander. In other words, it is conceivable that a corps commander might personally "fight his divisions" when under the direction of another general, although he himself had not been required to report to him. But it is hardly conceivable that he could be required to, or that he voluntarily would, fight under a general of inferior grade, and under either condition he certainly would be powerless to divert those troops from the duties to which they had been assigned by the army commander. It is the duty of every officer not otherwise engaged, irrespective of rank, to rally troops broken on the field, and it may be the duty of any officer to encourage by speech and to stimulate by example troops in a place of peril. But that does not imply the assumption of command. It was most laudable, as well as natural, that Gen. Stanley should desire to show himself to his own men about to make a countercharge, but in the nature of the case he could not of his own motion supersede the general on the spot. The question that he has raised is, after all, academical rather than practical. No one denies that Cox commanded before Stanley came on the field; Stanley himself says he gave Opdycke no order, whatever the reason; Cox exercised active command over Kimball in the transfer of one of his regiments to another point of combat; and there is no evidence that Stanley found any occasion to give any order to any one, however he might suppose himself authorized. Many of Wagner's routed men attached themselves to other organized commands and fought admirably, but the broken organizations themselves clung to the village whence no one brought them back.

The importance of the battle and the very curious technical complications that have

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

entangled its history, have carried us beyond all ordinary limits, and we can transcribe no part of the voluminous official records to support our view. But it seems perfectly clear that at the time both Cox and Stanley were actuated by the most patriotic motives and were filled with military *esprit*. Cox showed foresight, intelligence, courage, and perseverance; Stanley exhibited dash and valor and a challenge to danger so that he barely escaped death. He left the active front very soon after he was wounded, although there was severe fighting much later. Cox believes that he crossed the river immediately. Stanley asserts that, after leaving the centre, he rode first to the bridge and then to Kimball before going to the north side, and that is probably the fact. Gen. Cox's position in the unfortunate controversy has been maintained with dignity, and it is cause for great regret that Gen. Stanley has so violently resented Gen. Cox's original moderate statement of the case, and has gone beyond the matter in discussion to assail, as it seems ungenerously, this officer's record in other particulars. The reports do not show it, but it is probable that there was a rivalry closely approximating jealousy between the two corps, and that a consciousness of Stanley's actually superior rank to Schofield as well as to Cox required much diplomacy in administration. The unhappy outbreak we have had to notice may illustrate a lack of poise that Gen. Thomas may have had in mind when, reporting to Gen. Halleck that he had accorded Schofield rank over Stanley because he was a department commander, explained further that he was "much the more reliable commander of the two."

This Country of Ours. By Benjamin Harrison, ex-President of the United States. Scribners. 1897.

Mr. Harrison has written an informing and entertaining book. Without attempting to provide either a school manual on American government or an elementary treatise on constitutional law, he discourses pleasantly and instructively about the various departments of national administration, treating with particular fulness, as would naturally be expected, of the executive department, as the one with which he is most familiar. Of the twenty-one chapters, seven are devoted to the President and eight to the executive departments, while Congress and the judicial system are dismissed with but two chapters each. Of course this is all out of proportion, so far as an all-round treatment of the subject goes, and gives the impression that Mr. Harrison regards the executive part of the government as four times more important than all the others combined; still, the executive side of affairs has thus far received rather scanty treatment in the books, and what Mr. Harrison has to say, if not very profound, is at least readable and entertaining. The substance of the volume appeared originally as a series of articles in the *Ladies' Home Journal;* in its present form it gives a better idea of the daily life of a President than any recent book which has come to our notice.

So far as the solid part of the matter is concerned, it may be said at once, though without reproach, that the volume contains nothing new; the facts are the same that have been presented again and again in works of similar size, and the outline, at best, is slender. But one does not, as a rule, turn to books by men in Mr. Harrison's position so much for new facts as for interesting points of view and indications of the author's personality. Books on public affairs by those who only yesterday were leading participants, are interesting partly from what they include, partly from what they omit; and this is quite true of Mr. Harrison's volume. A careful reading of 'This Country of Ours' shows no changes of importance in the political notions of the author, which four years of Presidential service and frequent public utterance have made tolerably familiar. There is the same vague comment on the currency situation and the same commendation of the civil-service law. A curious endorsement of the diplomatic service as, on the whole, a somewhat important part of the national machinery, and worthy of respectable maintenance, together with a plea for reform in the consular service, go hand in hand with a condemnation of political speech-making by our foreign ministers; the reference here to Mr. Bayard being so thinly disguised that the Ambassador himself might as well have been named. We ought to push on our coast defences as rapidly as possible as a good means of giving international arbitration a lift; while the new navy is our pet and pride, and ought to be in every way encouraged. "There are two views of the pension question," Mr. Harrison tells us (p. 285); "one from the 'Little Round Top' at Gettysburg, looking out over a field sown thickly with the dead and around upon bloody, blackened, and maimed men cheering the shot-torn banner of their country; the other from an office-desk on a busy street, or from an endowed chair in a university, looking only upon a statistical table." We are not, to be sure, quite clear as to what this means, but Mr. Harrison leaves us in no doubt as to the point of view he would have us take.

It is interesting to find the author endorsing Speaker Reed's action in counting a quorum, and favoring the adoption of some form of closure in the Senate, as it is to find him protesting, with evident sincerity, against the time-consuming applications for office, and the inability of the President to secure even a small measure of privacy. Very straightforward, too, is his approval of the use of the army in suppressing domestic disorder. The reference to the office of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department as a place wherein may be found "some sketches and models that are at least suggestive of art," is grimly humorous. But what does Mr. Harrison mean (p. 277) when, after explaining the steps by which a State is admitted to the Union, and pointing out that from "this habit of dealing with the public domain has come the common thought that all territory that we acquire must, when sufficiently populous, be erected into States," he adds, "But why may we not take account of the quality of the people as well as of their numbers, if future acquisitions should make it proper to do so?" Is Mr. Harrison "hedging" in regard to Hawaii, or fixing the status of Cuba in advance?

We remarked that the book, like others of its kind, derives some interest from what it fails to say. We miss a discussion of several matters on which the author could, without doubt, throw a good deal of light. If we read the introduction aright, the volume is intended not so much to impart knowledge as to kindle patriotism. Now there are a number of things about the conduct of our national affairs that many fervent patriots would like to know. They would like to know, for example, about the composition and methods of the lobby at Washington. They would like to know how appropriation bills, and especially tariff bills, are made up. They would like to know why the House of Representatives allows itself to be stripped of its legislative functions and made to register the decrees of one of its members. They would like to know some of the causes of the degeneracy of the Senate. Very many would like to have explained to them, in a popular and intelligible fashion, the subjects of national expenditure; surely an ex-President could unfold, with telling effect, the real significance of the appropriations for rivers and harbors, for naval vessels, or for pensions. It will be matter of regret to many that Mr. Harrison has refrained from a discussion of any of these things.

As was said at the beginning, Mr. Harrison's book is chiefly important for the information it furnishes about the life and duties of the President and the department of the government with whose oversight he is particularly charged. The reader will find here a hundred details of official life—the dull and exhausting routine of daily work, the conduct of cabinet meetings, the preparation of official papers, departmental red-tape, and the like—set forth amiably and instructively. To any one, young or old, who cherishes the notion that the time of the Chief Magistrate of this republic is mainly occupied with the study of great public questions and the formulation of great national policies, we recommend a perusal of 'This Country of Ours.'

Haliburton: A Centenary Chaplet. Toronto: William Briggs. 1897.

This book resembles the World's Fair in that it lags a year behind the date which it celebrates. It is no great matter, however, that circumstances should have delayed the publication beyond December of 1896, when its appearance was due. Windsor, Nova Scotia, the place of Haliburton's birth, is also the seat of King's College, the oldest institution of its kind in the Colonies, and in 1884 the affectionate remembrance of Sam Slick's words and characters led to the founding there of a Haliburton Club. This society now publishes, under the title we have mentioned, three sketches, biographical and critical, of its patron saint. The authors are well qualified for their work, one, Mr. R. G. Haliburton, being a member of the family; another, Mr. H. P. Scott, the first President of the Haliburton Club, and the third, Mr. F. Blake Crofton, Provincial Librarian of Nova Scotia. They have evidently prepared their essays in complete independence of each other—so much so that we can point to a case where division between them relates not to opinion alone, but to a matter of fact. Mr. Haliburton, referring to Sam Slick's jokes (p. 30), says: "In all he has written there is not the slightest trace of impropriety, even by the most remote implication." Later on (p. 62), Mr. Crofton, who calls Judge Haliburton "an Epicurean philosopher, modified a little for the better by Christianity, and for the worse by practical politics," states that "his keen relish for the ludicrous has sometimes made him stoop to unmistakable *double entendres*. In palliation of some of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

these, at least, it may be urged that their wit preponderates over their grossness." Are we to praise this candor, or hint that there has been some looseness of editing?

One point which these three tributes have in common is insistence upon Haliburton's imperial views and propaganda. One seldom sees a motto on the cover of a book. In this instance the following sentiment is put forward with all the emphasis that a prominent place can give: "It shouldn't be England and her Colonies, but they should be integral parts of one great whole, . . . one vast home market from Hong-Kong to Labrador." Mr. R. G. Haliburton lashes the "Disintegrationists" who gave the tone to colonial policy when the Judge was member for Launceston in the British House of Commons. He flings first at Gladstone, "who has retired from public life, leaving behind him the fragments, not of a great Empire, but of a shattered party." We expect this kind of language from men of Mr. Haliburton's school, but he proves his freedom from party bias by quoting a snub Disraeli gave to Imperialism in 1852: "These wretched Colonies will all be independent in a few years, and are a millstone around our neck." Had Sam Slick's convictions on the subject of a close bond between the islands holding British allegiance been less strong, we might accuse his centenary admirers of connecting his name with a movement which happens to be popular. As it is, they may claim for him what credit may accrue from a forecast of the policy pursued by the Colonial Office under Chamberlain's guidance. Our own opinion is that the rôle of political prophet hardly comports with Haliburton so well as that of literary artist. His long experience on circuit and on the bench showed him human nature, and especially that part to which "soft sawder" appeals. His discourses and descriptions are often tedious. It is in dialogue where common sense, humor, and observation can be made to blend, that he excels. Sam Slick is an undoubted creation, and Artemus Ward called its author the father of American humor. The cleverest Canadians come from the Maritime Provinces, and that part of the Dominion can number among its representatives few so able and none so witty as Haliburton.

Some Unrecognized Laws of Nature: An Inquiry into the Causes of Physical Phenomena, with Special Reference to Gravitation. By Ignatius Singer and Lewis H. Berens. D. Appleton & Co. 1897. 8vo, pp. 511.

The purpose of this work is to revolutionize physics by showing that the cause of forces is a tendency to equalization, an action of which viscosity is a familiar example. Viscosity equalizes the velocity of the different layers of a stream. Now this, as is well known, is not a *conservative* force—that is, neglecting effects of heat, it appears to violate the law of energy; so that to make an action like viscosity the fundamental cause of all forces is to set up a theory in opposition to the doctrine of the conservation of energy. The principle of equalization is represented as one of four—persistence, unequal resistance, reciprocity, and equalization—from which the whole play of nature may be deduced. This formula was first remarked by the authors as governing the growth and development of animals and plants, and is now extended to pure physics.

All this might have been maintained, one would suppose, without calling in question the majority of the great discoveries, or propositions accepted as discoveries, which during the last three centuries have been so laboriously, and, as it would seem, so successfully, elaborated by physicists. But, as the discussion is conducted in this volume, substantially the entire body of established dynamics and physics is proposed to be swept away as worthless. Comprehending these circumstances, no person of good sense will undertake to read this book, unless as a study in psychology, without being thoroughly versed, at least, in every branch of mathematical physics; and those persons who really are competent to discuss questions of this kind will soon discover that neither Mr. Singer nor Mr. Berens is among their number.

What, for instance, is to be thought of authors who calmly remark that "not sufficient notice has been taken by physicists" of the law of action and reaction? That law, as everybody knows, is insured of thoroughgoing application by the aid of the conception of Mass. But these authors are capable of saying, "Whether a pendulum set swinging *in vacuo* and having no friction would actually keep on swinging for ever, . . . the matter of doubt in our mind is whether the downward pull of gravitation would not have to be regarded as another retarding element, besides friction and the resistance of the air." This betrays utter want of grasp of the principle of the pendulum, connected with a failure to distinguish between mass and weight. And, accordingly, we are informed that *mass*, in its last analysis, is nothing but *gravity*. Now this is not so. There might be no such force as gravitation, proportional to mass, and yet the action of bodies under magnetical and electrical forces, and under impact, would still proclaim the reality of mass so long as the law of action and reaction continued to operate.

We meet with equally gross misunderstandings when we pass to thermotics. For instance, we are told (pp. 24, 93) that the doctrine of the absolute zero rests upon nothing except "on the theory that at that temperature a body would be practically annihilated"; that is, the authors suppose the air or hydrogen thermometer is its only basis. One would find it hard to invent a remark which should more manifestly betray total ignorance of the theory of heat. Yet the following beats it: "The late Professor Tyndall held that heat was 'a mode of motion.' It is not quite clear whether the phrase is to be understood," etc. A man who does not know what the kinetical theory of heat is, and supposes Tyndall the author of it because of his popular book, and who nevertheless presumes to speak of the greatest physical speculator of our time except Helmholtz thus: "Thomson's error consisted in confounding the common or industrial meaning of the term 'work' with its philosophical meaning," cannot expect to make a favorable impression upon the scientific world. The book is simply chock-full of blunders quite as bad as the above few specimens.

The work is not entirely one of ratiocination. Various experimental results are announced which are supposed to support the theory. These are, for the most part, old mare's-nests which have already been sufficiently investigated. Some of them might be worth reëxamination with all our modern appliances of precision, but none of the experiments herein described appears to have been conducted with any extraordinary refinements. A few of them are rather curious, though probably not important.

The first words of the preface are these: "At last, after years of patient plodding in dim regions where the footprints are few and the pitfalls many, the time has arrived when we are enabled to place before the world of science the first-fruits of our explorations." No doubt a great part of two men's lives has gone into this enterprise, and it is tragic to see that the result is good only to fill a page in some supplement to the 'Budget of Paradoxes.'

The New Africa: A Journey up the Chobe and down the Okovanga Rivers. A Record of Exploration and Sport by Aurel Schulz, M.D., and August Hammar, C.E. With a map and seventy illustrations. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1897. Pp. xii, 406, 8vo.

The delay in the publication of this interesting account of a journey made in 1884 is the less to be regretted since a large part of the country traversed is still comparatively unknown. The object of Dr. Schulz and his companion was to explore the Chobe, a branch of the Zambesi, to its source, and from thence to cross to the west coast. They were able to trace this river for only some two hundred miles from its outlet near the Victoria Falls, the hostility of the natives preventing their further progress. Turning southward, they crossed a succession of sandbelts, and, after much suffering from hunger and thirst, succeeded in reaching the Okovanga. This stream, which is also called the Cubango, they were compelled to follow to Lake Ngami, in order to clear themselves before the King of the Baros and his council from the suspicion of having Matabele spies among their followers. After a most interesting trial, marked by dramatic incidents and indicating an unusual intelligence and sense of justice in the King and his chiefs, their innocence was established, and, after a long delay, they were permitted to return to Natal.

A considerable part of the volume is taken up with an account of the hunting adventures, which were numerous and exciting. It would be difficult to find in all the annals of African travel a more thrilling story than that which Jan Veyers told of his encounter with a lioness. Their "bag" included nearly all the large game of Central Africa, with the exception of the elephant, though the slaying was almost always for the sake of meat and not simply for sport. There are many interesting observations on the appearance and habits of the fauna of this region, as well as useful hints to travellers and sportsmen. The theory, for instance, that the aasvogel, or vulture, finds its prey by sight and not by scent, is supported by some convincing facts from the authors' own experience. On the Chobe the party shot the "mysterious situtunga," a water-buck whose feet "are abnormally long and slightly webbed at the base of the toes." This adapts it for swimming and for walking on the dense masses of tangled reeds that float over the deep water, but gives it a clumsy, waddling gait on land. Like the hippopotamus, it stays long under water, and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it also appears to live in perfect amity with the crocodiles which swarm in that part of the river in which it is found.

Of the people who inhabit these regions Dr. Schulz says little that is especially noteworthy. The raids of the Matabele had made the natives suspicious of strangers, and it was difficult to enter into friendly relations with them. The tribes living along the Chobe had been driven to the inaccessible swamps and islands, but the Baros of the lake region had just succeeded in repelling an invasion. Very striking was the contrast presented between the timidity, craftiness, and degradation of the former, and the self-reliance, intelligence, and comparative prosperity of the latter. We regret that our author has not given some information as to the recent history of the young King Moreni and his brave followers. His country is described as containing marvellously fertile districts, adapted for the cultivation of corn and of cotton, which grows wild, as easily irrigated, and as having a dry and healthy climate.

Dr. Schulz appears to have been a typical explorer. He had great powers of endurance, with perfect health, and he showed much tact and forbearance in dealing with the natives. Though often placed in circumstances extremely provocative of violence, there is no instance of his having injured any native, while his services as a doctor were in constant demand. The attachment which some of his followers felt for him is pleasantly shown in the account of their parting:

"Chiki held my hand long in his, and a tear rolled down his cheek as he said: 'Kolwani, I am only a black man, but my heart has grown white towards you. When you come to Panda Matenga again, shout out my name, "Chiki," and the trees and the birds will tell me you are there, and I, Chiki, will come to you, without stopping to eat on the road until I have seen your face.' 'And I also, and I also,' came from all the boys in chorus. Then some seized hold of both of Hammar's hands, and others of mine, and they danced around us, singing the farewell-song of their nation; then, as it came to an end, they seized their packs and hurried off at a run, never turning round, as if not trusting themselves to take a last look at us."

The volume is very attractive in its appearance, with excellent illustrations and a map drawn from observations by Mr. Hammar, but it unfortunately lacks an index.

Gleanings in Buddha-Fields. By Lafcadio Hearn. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1897.

Mr. Hearn, who has left the interior of the Princess Country for the capital, is now lecturer on English literature in the Imperial University in Tokyo. He has gathered in a fresh volume his "studies of hand and soul" in the Far East. "A Living God" is the title of a chapter which tells of what is daily seen in front of a Shinto shrine. Two other papers worthily preserve a number of specimens of those brief stanzas of song which have for over a thousand years been popular favorites. The street songs are as short and evanescent as flowers, but are also as entrancing. The more permanent folk-songs are rich in allusions to the Buddhist traditions and dogmas which underlie the popular faith. Mr. Hearn shows his keen sensitiveness and amazing power of discrimination and appreciation in catching and analyzing these fugitive, yet ever-reappearing, "swallow-flights of song." Kyoto and Osaka are brilliantly described in the author's characteristic style and with his own peculiar power of insight.

Probably the chapter that will excite the most interest and challenge opposition and provoke unbelief is that "About Faces in Japanese Art." To the average Westerner, "Japanese art is utterly wanting in facial expression." Even art critics who have lived awhile in "what to them is the country of topsy-turvydom" believe that the native artists' treatment of faces is fantastic and unnatural. Mr. Hearn, on the contrary, stoutly upholds and commends the Japanese limner. He beholds in the actual life around him "every normal type of face to be found in a Japanese picture-book." We agree with Mr. Hearn. To appreciate thoroughly, or even to qualify one's self to understand, Japanese art, one must have lived entirely away from European people and things. He must have looked long and impartially upon art and life in Japan in order to interpret these; and this, we may say, Mr. Hearn has done. So long as a drawing or other reproduction of the Japanese hand and soul is something other than a photograph, so long as the brain and culture of a Japanese are what they are, the artists of Nippon had better make haste slowly in imitating their foreign teachers.

Several other chapters treat of Buddhism, but here we confess that Mr. Hearn is less edifying and illuminating. Having read most if not all of this brilliant author's writings, we are impressed more with his dislike to missionaries and his devout adherence to Mr. Herbert Spencer's philosophy than with his grasp upon science, or philosophy, or original Buddhism. Here he displays or unskilfully conceals his animus. Surely no "hired converter" in all the empire is so persistently zealous in propagating his cult and dogmas as is the lecturer on English literature in preaching at all possible seasons the doctrine of the "Unknowable Reality." Apart from this tendency to polemic which vitiates his conclusions, and constantly compels question of the sanity of his judgments, one may enjoy Mr. Hearn's consummate literary art and exquisite gloss of style, while heartily grateful for the work of so subtle an interpreter of the most promising people in Asia.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

A Fiery Ordeal. Appletons. $1.
Arnold, Sarah L., and Gilbert, C. B. Stepping Stones to Literature. Fourth Reader. Boston: Silver, Burdett & Co. 60c.
Aulme, F. E. The Flags of the World. F. Warne & Co. $2.
Ayr, Landis. The Brown-Laurel Marriage. F. T. Neely.
Baxter, Katharine Schuyler. A God-Child of Washington. F. T. Neely. $10.
Bell, Mackenzie. Christina Rossetti: A Biographical and Critical Study. Boston: Roberts Bros. $2.50.
Bender's Lawyer's Diary and Directory for the State of New York, 1898. Albany: Matthew Bender.
Berger, François. French Method. Second Book. New York: The Author.
Book-Prices Current, 1897. London: Elliot Stock.
Book Sales of 1897. London: George Bell & Sons; New York: Macmillan. $6.50.
Brewer, A. T. How to Make a Sunday-School Go. Eaton & Mains. 60c.
Brown, John. Parasitic Wealth; or, Money Reform. Chicago: C. H. Kerr & Co.
Buchheim, Prof. C. A. Heine's Lieder und Gedichte. Macmillan. $1.
Caine, T. Hall. Recollections of Dante Gabriel Rossetti. New ed. Boston: Roberts Bros. $1.50.
Channing, Prof. Edward. A Students' History of the United States. Macmillan. $1.40.
Cleveland, Lucy. The Scarlet-Veined, and Other Poems. Randolph.
Cohn, Prof. Adolphe, and Woodward, B. D. Voltaire's Prose. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. $1.50.
Cole, S. W. The Child's First Studies in Music. Boston: Silver, Burdett & Co.
Cordery, J. G. The Odyssey of Homer. London: Methuen & Co.
Coxe, Virginia R. The Embassy Ball. F. T. Neely.
Crandall, C. H. The Chords of Life. Springdale, Conn.: The Author.
Cyr, Ellen M. The Children's Fourth Reader. Boston: Ginn & Co. 70c.
Davenport, H. C. Cartoons. New York: De Witt Publishing House.
De Leon, T. C. An Innocent Cheat. F. T. Neely.
Dunning, Prof. W. A. Essays on the Civil War and Reconstruction and Related Topics. Macmillan. $2.
Encyclopædia of Sport. Parts IX., X., and XI. Putnams. Each $1.
Gissing, George. The Whirlpool. F. A. Stokes Co. $1.25.
Gorion, M. Mémoires. II. A travers le crime. Paris: Flammarion; New York: Brentanos. 75c.
Gould, E. S. The Arithmetic of the Steam Engine. D. Van Nostrand Co. $1.
Hadow, W. H. A Croatian Composer: Notes toward the Study of Joseph Haydn. London: Seeley & Co.; New York: Macmillan. $1.25.
Hall, Tom. When Love Laughs. E. R. Herrick & Co.
Hannay, David. A Short History of the Royal Navy. 1217-1688. London: Methuen & Co.
Harbottle, T. B. Dictionary of Quotations (Classical). London: Sonnenschein; New York: Macmillan. $2.
Hart, Rev. T. W. Robert Sanders; or, Light Out of Darkness. New York: Irving Co.
Hazleton, G. C., jr. The National Capitol: its Architecture, Art, and History. New York: The Author.
Huntington, Rev. W. R. A Short History of the Book of Common Prayer. Whittaker. 25c.
Johnson, Henry. Where Beauty Is, and Other Poems. Brunswick, Me.: Byron Stevens. $1.25.
Joynes, Prof. E. S. Zschokke's Der Zerbrochene Krug. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. 25c.
Lancefield, R. T. Tim and Mrs. Tim. American News Co. 50c.
Lockyer, Sir Norman. The Sun's Place in Nature. Macmillan.
Lomax, A. E. Sir Henry Layard: His Adventures and Discoveries. Whittaker. 50c.
Lord, W. F. Sir Thomas Maitland: The Mastery of the Mediterranean. Longmans, Green & Co. $1.50.
Macgibbon, David, and Ross, Thomas. The Ecclesiastical Architecture of Scotland. Vol. III. Edinburgh: David Douglas.
Mackenzie, Prof. W. D. Christianity and the Progress of Man as Illustrated by Modern Missions. F. H. Revell Co. $1.25.
Mackinnon, James. Leisure Hours in the Study. London: T. Fisher Unwin.
Marks, A. H. Igerne, and Other Writings. Nashville, Tenn.: Hunter & Welburn.
Masters, Caroline. The World's Coarse Thumb. F. Warne & Co. $1.25.
Mather, Marshall. John Ruskin, his Life and Teaching. 5th ed. F. Warne & Co. $1.25.
McCrindle, J. W. The Christian Topography of Cosmas, an Egyptian Monk. London: Printed for the Hakluyt Society.
Miller, Joaquin. Complete Poetical Works. San Francisco: Whittaker & Ray Co. $2.50.
Moss, Frank. The American Metropolis. 3 vols. New York: P. F. Collier.
New Puritanism, The. Fords, Howard & Hulbert.
Pearce, W. J. Painting and Decorating. London: Chas. Griffin & Co.; Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co. $3.75.
Petrie, W. M. F. Religion and Conscience in Ancient Egypt. London: Methuen & Co.
Potter, Dr. La Forest. The Psychology of Health and Happiness. Boston: Philosophical Publishing Co. $1.
Powers, G. W. England and the Reformation, 1485-1603. [Oxford Manuals.] Scribners. 50c.
Raymond, Frances. Maylou. G. W. Dillingham Co.
Riley, J. W. Sketches in Prose. Afterwhiles. Scribners.
Rose, Dr. Achilles. Christian Greece and Living Greek. New York: Peri Hellados Publication Office.
Rosen, Dr. Fritz. Modern Persian Colloquial Grammar. London: Luzac & Co.
Scott, F. G. The Unnamed Lake, and Other Poems. Toronto: William Briggs.
"Scribner's Magazine." Vols. xxi. and xxii. Scribners.
Sermons on the Sunday-School Lessons for 1898. Boston: Pilgrim Press.
Sidis, Boris. The Psychology of Suggestion. Appletons. $1.75.
Spencer, T. J. Moultrie De Kalb. G. W. Dillingham Co. 50c.
Todd, Prof. D. P. A New Astronomy. For Beginners. American Book Co. $1.30.
Tyrrell, J. W. Across the Sub-Arctics of Canada. Toronto: William Briggs.
Vivian, Herbert. Servia, the Poor Man's Paradise. Longmans, Green & Co. $4.
Watt, J. C. Engineering and Architectural Jurisprudence. London: Chapman & Hall; New York: John Wiley & Sons. $6.
Walkey, S. In Quest of Sheba's Treasure. F. Warne & Co. $1.50.
Walworth, Mrs. J. H. On the Winning Side. R. F. Fenno & Co. $1.25.
Ward, Wilfrid. The Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman. 2d ed. 2 vols. Longmans, Green & Co. $6.
Warren Hyde. New York: R. F. Fenno & Co. $1.25.
Watson, E. W. Songs of Flying Hours. Philadelphia: H. T. Coates & Co.
Watson, William. The Hope of the World, and Other Poems. John Lane. $1.25.
Webb, Sidney and Beatrice. Industrial Democracy. 2 vols. Longmans, Green & Co. $8.
Wells, Prof. B. W. Helbig's Komödie auf der Hochschule. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. 30c.
Whitman, Walt. The Wound-Dresser: A Series of Letters from Hospitals in Washington. Boston: Small, Maynard & Co. $1.50.
Wiley, F. B. Flowers That Never Fade. Boston: Bradlee Whidden. 35c.
Young, F. K. The Grand Tactics of Chess. Boston: Roberts Bros. $3.50.
Younghusband, Capt. Francis. South Africa of To-day. Macmillan. $3.50.
Zangwill, Louis. Cleo, the Magnificent. G. W. Dillingham Co.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"To men like myself it is a sort of working library. Its volumes stand always at my elbow."—PROF. PAUL H. HANUS OF HARVARD.

FEBRUARY

EDUCATIONAL REVIEW.

Edited by Professor NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER.

ARTICLES.—Functions of the State Touching Education, by Andrew S. Draper; Religious Instruction in American Schools, by Levi Seeley; Student life at Jena, by Stuart H. Rowe; The public school and community life, by James K. Paulding; The economy in high wages for teachers, by John Davidson; History in the German Gymnasia, by Lucy M. Salmon.
DISCUSSION.—Principles of the new education applied in Algebra, Joseph V. Collins.
REVIEWS. EDITORIAL

$3 a year (monthly, excepting July and August), 35 cents per copy. Contents, Vols. I.-XIV., free.

HENRY HOLT & CO.,

29 West 23d St., New York: 378 Wabash Ave., Chicago.

The American College in American Life.

By CHARLES F. THWING, President of Western Reserve University, author of "American Colleges," etc. 12mo, gilt top, $1.50.

CHIEF CONTENTS.—Its Increasing Power—Certain Great Results—Its Influence Over and Through Individuals—Its Influence Illustrated in the Three Oldest Colleges—Certain Adjustments of its Ethical and Religious Forces to its Intellectual—The Increasing Cost of its Education—Its Power in the Future.

"Mr. Thwing is in a position to discuss this subject learnedly, and he has already written several books along the same line."—*Hamilton Literary Magazine.*

"The volume is crowded with practical lessons, impressively given. . . . The subject-matter is of great value."—*Chicago Inter Ocean.*

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS
NEW YORK AND LONDON.

CLARENDON PRESS.

Lange's German Course.

By HERMANN LANGE.

I. **GERMANS AT HOME;** A Practical Introduction to German Conversation, with an Appendix containing the Essentials of German Grammar. Third Edition, 8vo, 60c.
II. **GRAMMAR OF THE GERMAN LANGUAGE.** 8vo, 90c.
III. **GERMAN MANUAL;** a German Grammar, Reading Book, and a Handbook of German Conversation. Second Edition. 8vo, $1.90.
IV. **GERMAN COMPOSITION;** A Theoretical and Practical Guide to the Art of Translating English Prose into German. Third Edition, 8vo, $1.10.

For sale by all booksellers. Send for Catalogue.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS,
AMERICAN BRANCH,
91 and 93 Fifth Avenue, New York.

RECENTLY PUBLISHED.

Weeping Ferry.

By MARGARET L. WOODS, author of "A Village Tragedy," etc. Crown 8vo, $1.50.

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.,
PUBLISHERS,
91-93 Fifth Avenue, New York.

Funk & Wagnalls Standard Dictionary
Given free as a reward for a few hours' work among your friends. Easy, sure. No money required. If not interested confer a favor on some friend by calling attention to this offer. For full particulars address THOMAS M. UPP, P. O. Box 2572, New York city.

APPLETONS'

Popular Science Monthly.

FEBRUARY, 1898.

The United States Forest Reserve. CHARLES D. WALCOTT, Director U. S. Geological Survey.
Giving the history of the movement in favor of forest reserves, showing their great importance from a commercial as well as æsthetic standpoint, and describing the reserves at present existing.

Scientific Progress in the Closing Century. Prof. LUDWIG BÜCHNER.
A brief historical sketch of the most fertile period in the world's history from a scientific standpoint.

What is Property? (Principles of Taxation, XV.) Hon. DAVID A. WELLS.
Showing the loose notions that prevail regarding the meaning of "property," and the vicious results which this ignorance has brought about, through taxation.

The Primary Social Settlement. KATE KINGSLEY IDE.
A discussion of the "Home End of the Social Problem—the Family," including a brief historical sketch, showing the place it has occupied in various stages of human progress.

School Gardens. HENRY LINCOLN CLAPP.
Shows the happy results which have followed their introduction in the common schools of many European cities, points out their various advantages, and describes one which was started in Boston several years ago.

Evolutionary Ethics. HERBERT SPENCER.
Mr. Spencer's reply to Huxley's famous Romanes Lecture, of which this is the first authorized American publication.

Other Articles: The Evolution of the Mind; Modern Social Problems (Racial Geography, XIII.); Feet and Hands, II.; Education in the Animal Kingdom, and Sketch (with Portrait) of Charles D. Walcott.

Editor's Table; Scientific Literature; Fragments of Science; Notes.

50 cents a number; $5.00 a year.

D. APPLETON AND COMPANY,
72 Fifth Avenue, New York.

Yale Mixture.

A GENTLEMAN'S SMOKE.

You won't know the luxury of Pipe-Smoking until you use Yale Mixture.

A two-oz. trial package, postpaid, for 25 cts.

MARBURG BROS.,
The American Tobacco Co., Successor,
Baltimore, Md.

How TO SEE THE AND PLACE IT. Point

Punctuation Without Rules of Grammar.

A book of forty pages which teaches punctuating rapidly by example. Many people who have studied English, Latin, and Greek Grammar are very careless and slovenly punctuators. This book is indispensable to all writers. Memorizing rules and exceptions wastes time and they are soon forgotten. By mail 20 cents.

LACONIC PUBLISHING CO., 123 Liberty St., N.Y.

Letters of Credit. We buy and sell bills of exchange to and make Cable Transfers of money on Europe, Australia, and South Africa; also make collections and issue Commercial and Travellers' Credits, available in all parts of the world.

BROWN BROTHERS & CO.
NO. 59 WALL STREET, NEW YORK.

KINDERGARTEN SUPPLIES
at SCHERMERHORN'S, 3 East 14th Street, N. Y.
Send for new Catalogue.

Houghton, Mifflin & Co.'s BOOKS OF 1897.

BIOGRAPHY.

The Story of Jesus Christ: An Interpretation. By ELIZABETH STUART PHELPS. With many illustrations. Crown 8vo, $2.00.

The Life and Letters of Harriet Beecher Stowe. Edited by Mrs. JAMES T. FIELDS. With a portrait. 16mo, $2.00. *Large-paper Edition*, uniform with the Large-paper Edition of Mrs. Stowe's Works. $4.00 *net.*

Memories of Hawthorne.
By his daughter, ROSE HAWTHORNE LATHROP. With a new portrait of Hawthorne. Crown 8vo, gilt top, $2.00.

A Correspondence between John Sterling and Ralph Waldo Emerson. Edited, with a Sketch of Sterling's Life, by EDWARD W. EMERSON. 16mo, $1.00.

Life and Times of Edward Bass, First Bishop of Massachusetts (1726-1803). By DANIEL DULANY ADDISON. With a portrait. 8vo, $3.00 *net.*

The Life of Ernest Renan.
By MADAME JAMES DARMESTETER. With portrait. 12mo, gilt top, $1.50.

John Donne.
Sometime Dean of St. Paul's, A.D. 1621-1631. By AUGUSTUS JESSOPP, D.D. With two portraits. 12mo, $1.25.

Hawthorne's First Diary.
With an Account of its Discovery and Loss. By S. T. PICKARD. Illustrated. 16mo. $1.00.

John Hopkins Morison.
A Memoir. With portraits. Crown 8vo, $1.50.

Reminiscences and Letters of Caroline C. Briggs. Edited by GEORGE S. MERRIAM. Portrait. 12mo, $2.00.

A Dictionary of American Authors.
By OSCAR FAY ADAMS. Crown 8vo, $3.00.

RELIGION AND PHILOSOPHY.

The Theology of an Evolutionist.
By LYMAN ABBOTT, D.D. 16mo, gilt top, $1.25.

Gleanings in Buddha Fields.
Studies of Hand and Soul in the Far East. By LAFCADIO HEARN. 16mo, $1.25.

Seven Puzzling Bible Books.
A Supplement to "Who Wrote the Bible?" By WASHINGTON GLADDEN, D.D. 16mo, $1.25.

Inequality and Progress.
By GEORGE HARRIS, D.D., President of Andover Theological Seminary. 16mo, $1.25.

Faith and Fellowship.
By JOHN CUCKSON. 16mo, $1.25.

Immortality and the New Theodicy.
By GEORGE A. GORDON, D.D. 16mo, $1.00.

The Chief End of Man.
By GEORGE S. MERRIAM. Crown 8vo, $1.50.

The Open Mystery: A Reading of the Mosaic Story. By Mrs. A. D. T. WHITNEY. 16mo, $1.25.

ESSAYS.

Talks on the Study of Literature.
By ARLO BATES, Professor of English in the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Crown 8vo, $1.50.

Varia.
By AGNES REPPLIER. 16mo, gilt top, $1.25.

Nineteenth Century Questions.
By JAMES FREEMAN CLARKE, D.D. Crown 8vo, $1.50.

Sold by all Booksellers. Sent, postpaid, by
HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN & CO., Boston, 11 East 17th St., New York.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED